FOREWIND

DOGGER BANK
TEESSIDE A & B

March
2014

Consultation Report
Appendix L

Second Phase Section 47 Responses & Forewind Regard (Dogger Bank Teesside A & B)

Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001

Application Reference 5.1.12

FOREWIND

DOGGER BANK
TEESSIDE A & B

March
2014

Consultation Report Appendix L.1

List of all responses received from Section 47 consultees during the second phase of statutory consultation

Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001

Application Reference 5.1.12

Consultee	Stage	Issues raised
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	04/11/2013	Consultation
Norwegian Coastal Administration	11/11/2013	Consultation
Cleveland Potash Ltd.	11/11/2013	Consultation
Surfers Against Sewage	12/11/2013	Consultation
TS_2nd Stage S47_R1	12/11/2013	Fish and Shellfish, Commercial Fisheries
TS_2nd Stage S47_R2	18/11/2013	Consultation
Royal Yachting Association	20/11/2013	Shipping and Navigation
National Trust	28/11/2013	Consultation
Tees Valley RIGS	28/11/2013	Consultation
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP / New Under Ten metre Fishermen's Association (NUFTA) / Precision Marine Survey Limited	29/11/2013	Fish and Shellfish, Commercial Fisheries
Tees Valley RIGS	29/11/2013	Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality
TS_2nd Stage S47_R3	30/11/2013	Designated Sites
Surfers Against Sewage	02/12/2013	Project Description
Sveriges Fiskares Riksforbund	02/12/2013	Consultation
Norwegian Fishermen's Association	03/12/2013	Project Description, Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Commercial Fisheries
Kirkleatham Memorial Limited	07/12/2013	Project Description, Assessment of Alternatives, Traffic and Access, Noise
Tees Valley RIGS	10/12/2013	Project Description, Marine Physical Processes, Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality, Marine and Intertidal Ecology
TS_2nd Stage S47_R4	10/12/2013	Consultation
Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society	12/12/2013	Marine Mammals
Redcar Fishermen's Association	12/12/2013	Project Description, Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Shellfish Ecology
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	13/12/2013	Assessment of Alternatives, Consultation, Fish and Shellfish, Commercial Fisheries, Marine and Intertidal Ecology
TS_2nd Stage S47_R5	16/12/2013	Consultation

Consultee	Stage	Issues raised
Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Elevages Marins du Nord/Pas de Calais/Picardie (CRPMEM)	17/12/2013	Consultation
North Sea Regional Advisory Council	18/12/2013	Consultation
Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Elevages Marins du Nord/Pas de Calais/Picardie (CRPMEM)	20/12/2013	Commercial Fisheries
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	20/12/2013	Fish and Shellfish, Shipping and Navigation
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	20/12/2013	Project Description, Commercial Fisheries
North Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	20/12/2013	Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Commercial Fisheries
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	20/12/2013	Marine and Coastal Ornithology
The Wildlife Trusts	20/12/2013	Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Marine Mammals
Chamber of Shipping	08/01/2014	Shipping and Navigation
North Sea Regional Advisory Council	10/01/2014	Project Description, Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Commercial Fisheries

FOREWIND

DOGGER BANK
TEESSIDE A & B

March
2014

Consultation Report Appendix L.2

Detailed responses received from Section 47 consultees during the second phase of statutory consultation, and the regard that Forewind has had to responses received

Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001

Application Reference 5.1.12

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
5 Project Description						
Surfers Against Sewage	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	02/12/2013	Following the request for maps, SAS requested images of turbines that would be used for the project. It was highlighted that this has not yet been decided, but that they could find indicative information in Chapter 5 Project Description on the Forewind website.	N	Forewind noted the request and informed SAS that project infrastructure had not yet been decided, but indicative information can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description	**05 Project Description**
Norwegian Fishermen's Association	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	03/12/2013	A meeting with members of the Norwegian Fishermen's Organisation. The meeting was to update the fishermen on the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B projects ahead of the PEI3 submission and answer any questions they may have. The main topics of discussion were Fish and Shellfish, Commercial fishing, project infrastructure and mitigation measures. The minutes for the meeting were sent out post-PEI3. At the meeting, the fishermen would likely not continue to fish within the wind farm	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further information on project infrastructure can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description	**05 Project Description**
Kirkleatham Memorial Limited	TS s47 Within 1km Second Stage	07/12/2013	An email from the landowners of the new crematorium, highlighting concerns over the location and proximity of the cable route to the crematorium, including the purpose of temporary working areas	N	Forewind noted the comments received from the Kirkleatham Memorial concerning the temporary working areas. The intermediate compounds are designed for site storage, welfare facilities and machinery parking, and once all work is completed along that section of the route, the working areas will be removed and the land reinstated. Further information on these sites can be	**05 Project Description**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
					found in Chapter 5 Project Description	
Tees Valley RIGS	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/12/2013	A response from Tees Valley RIGS regarding the temporary working areas in the vicinity of landfall and potential impact on local geological features found in this area	Y	Forewind has noted the comments from Tees Valley RIGS and the potential impact on geological features at the landfall. Following this, Forewind narrowed of the width of the temporary working areas in the near shore area. Further information on this can be found in Section 2.1	**05 Project Description, Section 2.1**
Redcar Fishermen's Association	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/12/2013	A meeting with fishermen from Redcar to update them on the Teesside A & B projects. Commercial fisheries baseline, fish ecology studies and impact assessments were discussed as well as mitigation measures on installation of the cables. Forewind suggested that community group meetings would be a good idea, as well as early warning of surveys and operational works.	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further information on project infrastructure can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description	**05 Project Description**
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	We consider that fisheries access should be considered in promoting safe fisheries access when determining the layout of infrastructure for each project alongside other considerations. The project description mentions that it is anticipated that in some places it will not be possible to bury a cable and therefore we suggest that these areas are identified in the Environmental Statement so that a clearer picture can be obtained on where	Y	Fisheries access in relation to the layout of offshore infrastructure is considered within Chapter 15. Initial geophysical data was collected for the purposes of characterisation and not detailed design. Further detailed geophysical surveys will be undertaken post consent to further determine burial feasibility. However, where burial is not	**15 Commercial Fisheries** **15 Commercial Fisheries**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			potential risks may exist. Burial risk should be assessed to the extent possible within the ES and not left for elaboration as a post consent procedure. The fishing industry should be consulted on any post consent risk assessments and cable burial and cable crossing proposals Fisheries access should also be considered with respect to inter-array and platform cabling arrangements alongside other relevant considerations, where the objective is to minimise risk to both cable and fishing activity (3.8.6). The ES (Chapter 5) does not appear to define a policy to bury these cables, though we assume that will be the case. Post installation trawl surveys or equivalent should be employed in areas were bottom towed gear fisheries operate in order to verify that these areas can be fished safely. Any disposal of spoil from seabed preparation and drilling should only be disposed in ways that do not present risk to fishing activity in the area. This matter does not seem to be currently considered		feasible cable protection will be used and where this represents a worst case scenario this has been fully assessed within the Environmental Statement. For the purposes of Commercial Fisheries, concrete mattresses are assessed as the worst case scenario for snagging risk within Chapter 15. This has been acknowledged by Forewind. Forewind's policy is to bury or protect all Dogger Bank Teesside A & B offshore cables appropriately along their full length. Further detail can be found in Chapter 5 Section 3.9.13. Fisheries access in respect to cabling arrangements is considered within Chapter 15. This is acknowledged by Forewind. Cable protection will be designed to be over-trawlable and post installation surveys will ensure burial of cables where required. A disposal site characterisation report has been produced for Dogger Bank Teesside A & B and can be found in Appendix 12F.	**05 Project Description, Section 3.9.13** **15 Commercial Fisheries** **Appendix 12F** **09 Marine Physical Processes**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
					Clarifications regarding the disposal of spoil have also been provided within Chapter 9.	
North Sea Regional Advisory Council	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/01/2014	Ch. 5: Project Description: NSRAC consider that fisheries access should be considered in prompting safe fisheries access in determining the layout of infrastructure for each project. NSRAC welcome the approach to bury export cables where possible and highlight that exposed cables or poorly installed protective measures present a safety and snagging risk to fishing activities and not just a risk to damaging the cable. Ch. 5: Project Description: NSRAC suggest that where it is anticipated that it will not be possible to bury a cable (as mentioned in 3.9.15) these areas are identified in the ES to provide a clearer picture on where potential risks may exist. Burial risk should be assess to the extent possible within the ES and not left for elaboration as a post consent procedure. Ch. 5: Project Description: The fishing industry should be consulted on any post consent risk assessments and cable burial and cable crossing proposals. Ch. 5: Project Description: Fisheries access should also be considered with respect to inter-array and platform cabling, where the objective is to minimise		Fisheries access in relation to the layout of offshore infrastructure is considered within Chapter 15. Initial geophysical data was collected for the purposes of characterisation and not detailed design. Further detailed geophysical surveys will be undertaken post consent to further determine burial feasibility. However, where burial is not feasible cable protection will be used and where this represents a worst case scenario this has been fully assessed within the Environmental Statement. For the purposes of Commercial Fisheries, concrete mattresses are assessed as the worst case scenario for snagging risk within Chapter 15. This has been acknowledged by Forewind. Forewind's policy is to bury or protect all Dogger Bank Teesside A & B offshore cables appropriately along their full length. Further detail can be	**15 Commercial Fisheries** **15 Commercial Fisheries** **05 Project Description, Section 3.9.13** **15 Commercial Fisheries**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			risk to both cable and fishing activity (3.8.6). Chapter 5 does not appear to define a policy to bury these cables, though we assume that will be the case. Ch. 5: Project Description: Post-installation trawl surveys should be employed in area where cable burial has taken place, to verify that the cable assets are over-trawlable. Ch. 5: Project Description: Disposal of spoil from seabed preparation and drilling should be done in a way that does not present risk to fishing activity in the area. This matter does not seem to be considered (3.6.1)		found in Chapter 5 Section 3.9.13. Fisheries access in respect to cabling arrangements is considered within Chapter 15. This is acknowledged by Forewind. Cable protection will be designed to be over-trawlable and post installation surveys will ensure burial of cables where required. A disposal site characterisation report has been produced for Dogger Bank Teesside A & B and can be found in Appendix 12F. Clarifications regarding the disposal of spoil have also been provided within Chapter 9.	**Appendix 12F 09 Marine Physical Processes**
6 Assessment of Alternatives						
Kirkleatham Memorial Limited	TS s47 Within 1km Second Stage	07/12/2013	Landowners of the new crematorium, highlighted concerns over the location and proximity of the cable route to the crematorium, including the purpose of temporary working areas.	N	Forewind noted the comments received from the Kirkleatham Memorial. An extensive site selection process has been undertaken, Section 4 – Stage 6 of Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives, onshore cable route selection describes the site selection process for the cable route, and the development criteria considered.	**06 Assessment of Alternatives**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present	13/12/2013	An introductory meeting between Forewind, the Hartlepool Fishermen's society and EPIC regeneration prior to the	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further information on the offshore site	**06 Assessment of Alternatives**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
	Second Stage		meeting with the Hartlepool Fishermen. Topics discussed included cumulative impacts, mitigation, potential re-routing of the cables and the impact of the project on the fishing fleet		selection process can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	
7 Consultation						
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	04/11/2013	FW received a letter from Epic regeneration LLC in which they stated they are representing the Hartlepool Fishermen's Society (HFS), with concerns over the level of consultation to date with the HFS.	N	Forewind noted the communication and sent a response clarifying the development programme and details and any incorrect assumptions made about consultation.	**N/A**
Norwegian Coastal Administration	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	11/11/2013	A request for the Draft Outline Decommissioning Statement and Draft Safety Zone Statement following the notification of pre-application consultation.	N	Forewind noted the request and sent the requested material to the NCA general email and a primary contact	**N/A**
Surfers Against Sewage	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/11/2013	A request from SAS for maps showing CB and TS offshore zones for their records to send to members.	N	Forewind noted the request and sent the maps	**N/A**
TS_2nd Stage S47_R2	TS s47 Within 1km Second Stage	18/11/2013	An email informing Forewind that the councillor would not be able to attend the exhibition on Friday 22. The councillor also asked if any funding was available for the Redcar Cenotaph. Forewind replied to highlight the other two exhibitions at the time, and that it is not possible for Forewind to provide any community funding at this time.	N	Forewind noted the response and highlighted the additional exhibition dates	**N/A**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
Tees Valley RIGS	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	28/11/2013	An email from Tees Valley RIGS thanking Forewind for meeting with them. They confirmed who the primary contacts were for Forewind and Tees Valley RIGS and requested Forewind's geological data. They also confirmed that they would submit a response to the consultation by the deadline.	N	Forewind noted the email from Tees Valley RIGS and ensured all records were updated. Forewind will share geological data with the group where possible, and existing geological data can be found in the Preliminary Environmental Information in Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes and Chapter 20 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality	**09 Marine Physical Processes 24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality**
National Trust	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	28/11/2013	A call from the National Trust, requesting a DVD of the PEI and a copy of the display boards.	N	Forewind noted the request from the National Trust and sent a DVD to the National trust, as well as an email with the exhibition panels and community consultation summary attached	**N/A**
Sveriges Fiskares Riksforbund	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	02/12/2013	A follow up email for the statutory consultation period to see whether a meeting or call is required. The group replied to say they had received the material and they maintain the opinions that they gave to Forewind back in February	Y	Forewind noted the response and that the response has not changes	**N/A**
North East Process Industry Cluster (NEPIC)	TS s47 Within 1km Second Stage	05/12/2013	An email highlighting that Chapter 22 was not available on the DVD that they have taken from the public exhibitions. Forewind emailed back with the link to their website where the chapter can be found	N	Forewind noted the problem with the DVD and directed the stakeholder to the requested chapter, as well as offering to send a new DVD	**N/A**
Cleveland Potash Ltd.	TS s47 Non-	09/12/2013	An email chain organising meeting arrangements for Teesside A & B impact	N	Forewind noted the emails, and a meeting was set for the new year	**N/A**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
	present Second Stage		assessments and concerns over subsidence, including a draft agenda for the meeting		to discuss the proposals for Dogger Bank Teesside A & B	
TS_2nd Stage S47_R4	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/12/2013	A letter from a member of the public stating they could not make the exhibitions in Teesside, therefore they would like to request a DVD of the Preliminary Environmental Information and the draft NTS. Forewind sent the DVD, NTS and Community Consultation Summary out.	N	Forewind noted the request and sent out the DVD and NTS to the member of the public, as well as the Community Consultation Summary as it has a summary of the exhibition panels	**N/A**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	13/12/2013	A second meeting with the Hartlepool fishermen that was held to discuss the Teesside projects with the fishermen. An overview of commercial fisheries, fish ecology and impact assessments was given. Forewind highlighted that working group meetings would be a good idea and that Forewind will endeavour to provide all fishermen with early warning of surveys or operations. The fishermen believe that the impacts on themselves are major as opposed to minor or moderate	N	Forewind noted the comments received during the meeting and will endeavour to organise working group meetings going forward	**N/A**
TS_2nd Stage S47_R5	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	16/12/2013	A letter advising Forewind that the stakeholder's address had changed and would like to continue receiving updates, therefore he is providing his new address	N	Forewind noted the new address of the stakeholder so that continued updates could be sent	**N/A**
Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Elevages Marins du Nord/Pas de Calais/Picardie	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	17/12/2013	An email chain requesting the shape files for the offshore cable corridors, which were provided. The chain begins with an email to see if representatives of CPRMEM wanted to meet to discuss PEI3	N	Forewind noted the request by the CRPMEM and that the shape files were provided	**N/A**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
(CRPMEM)			or if they had any concerns			
North Sea Regional Advisory Council	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	18/12/2013	An email chain from NSRAC advising they are unable to meet the PEI3 response deadline. FW responded that there will not be an extension to the formal PEI3 response deadline, but that if NSRAC provide responses by 10-Jan-13 then FW will try and apply them where practical to do so.	N	Forewind noted the email from the NSRAC. Forewind replied to highlight that December 20 is the deadline for consultation responses, therefore comments received after this date may not be considered, however should the response be received by January 10, Forewind will endeavour to consider their comments if possible	**N/A**
8 Designated Sites						
TS_2nd Stage S47_R3	TS s47 Within 1km Second Stage	30/11/2013	An update to a question posed at the Teesside Exhibitions, the resident confirmed that whilst there is an interest in extending the heritage coast from Filey to the mouth of the Tees, only the North Yorks and Cleveland Coastal forum has extended its interest in this area.	N	Forewind noted the response and that the Heritage Coast had not been officially extended to the mouth of the Tees River	**08 Designated Sites**
09 Marine Physical Processes						
Tees Valley RIGS	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/12/2013	Tees Valley RIGS concerns are with regards to the Red Howles Site at cable landfall. 'The Red Howles Site was identified and assessed during 2012/2013 and considered worthy of RIGS status for two reasons. It is one of a small number of outcrops of the Calcareous Shale Member of the Redcar Mudstone Formation. The outcrop also illustrates the	Y	Forewind noted the comments received from Tees Valley RIGS and the concern highlighted over the Red Howles site at the landfall. Forewind recognises the potential for accidental damage during construction and has reduced the size of temporary working areas around the landfall	**05 Project description**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			presence of an articlinal structure between Red Howles and Redcar Rocks. The Red Howles RIGS site is included in the Redcar & Cleveland Council draft Local Plan out for consultation at present. The Purpose of the designation of the Red Howles site is to protect it from damage. From the information provided by you it appears that the site is not directly affected by your landfall proposals. It would be desirable that positive measure be taken during construction to ensure that accidental damage does not occur from heavy equipment or any other actions'.		to mitigate this. Further information on this change can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description	
11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology						
The Wildlife Trusts	TS S42 Second Stage	20/12/2013	The area of principle concern to the Wildlife Trust is the black-legged kittiwake as the report states that the Flamborough Head population is stable and potentially increasing however, it is the understanding of the Wildlife Trust that the population is not stable and has experienced declines. This being reflected in the reduction in numbers at Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA. The Wildlife Trust believe that in absence of 'favourable conservation status' for kittiwake in the UK, there is not a sufficiently robust audit mechanism to allow review of the kittiwake population at Flamborough.	Y	The reference to populations in the proposed Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA, rather than the existing Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA, follows previous advice provided by Natural England on the HRA Screening for Dogger Bank Creyke Beck, that for the purposes of the Dogger Bank ES and HRA, these potential changes should be reflected in the	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Sections 4, 5 and 6**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			The Wildlife Trust support the concerns of the RSPB about collision for kittiwake from Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA. We note that the Draft ES refers to the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA rather than the existing Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA. The assessment should be made against the existing SPA, as the pSPA hasn't been formally consulted upon. The Wildlife Trust support the RSPB's views on the use of Band Option 3 Model for collision risk. We suggest that the assessment should use either Option 1 and 98% thereby facilitating cumulative impact assessment, or present both Option 3 and Option 1 across a range of avoidance rates. We note that Option 1 has been presented in an appendix, but not carried forward into the assessment. The Wildlife Trust state that 98% should remain the default avoidance rate for gannet, until empirical evidence is available to justify a change applicable to breeding as well as non-breeding seasons. The Wildlife Trust support the concerns of the RSPB that PBR has not been validated for birds or mammals. The RSPB consider that PBR is appropriate for identifying levels of take which almost		assessment of this proposal's impacts on the SPA. Further information on this can be found in Sections 4, 5 and 6. A separate document (Forewind and SmartWind 2013) has been produced to provide a review of avoidance rates of seabirds at offshore wind farms and the applicability of their use within the Band collision risk model. Further information on this can be found in Sections 4, 5 and 6. Discussion with regards to Collision Risk Modelling options and the appropriate avoidance rates to use within Collision Risk Modelling is ongoing. To inform this, a separate document (Forewind and SmartWind 2013) has been produced to provide a review of avoidance rates of seabirds at offshore wind farms and the applicability of their use within the Band collision risk model. We also note the MROG Paper "Summary of current issues	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Sections 4, 5 and 6** **11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Sections 4, 5 and 6**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			certainly cannot be sustained by a population, but that outputs are not suitable for proposing levels of take which can be sustained. Once wind turbines are erected, there will be limited scope for modifying 'take' if it is not suitable.		with Collision Risk Modelling approaches". As is noted, further work has been commissioned by Marine Scotland that should also better inform this issue. Further information on this can be found in Sections 4, 5 and 6.	
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	TS S42 Second Stage	20/12/2013	Appendix 11A Ornithology Technical Report Section 2.1.6. It is unfortunate that the number of categories and the bandwidths for flight height estimation varied over time around the critical height of the lower blade sweep. Appendix 11A Ornithology Technical Report. Population estimation. Information is not presented as to the fit of each model for each species, so it is not possible to determine appropriateness of adopted figures in each and every case. Model based methods are recommended for this purpose Buckland et al. 2012). Appendix 11A Ornithology Technical Report Section 2.7.7. The basis for regional population estimation relies on old (ESAS) data and therefore may not be applicable for context with recently collected site-based data. Appendix 11A Ornithology Technical Report Table 4.5 Gannet – connectivity also applies to Bass Rock in winter, see	Y	An extra flight height category was added during the period of data collection to provide improved understanding of behaviour. Further information on this can be found in Appendix 11A, Section 2.1.6 A manuscript on the population modelling has been prepared for publication in the scientific literature and is currently (January 2014) under peer-review. This provides additional confirmation of the modelling procedure and of model fit. It is acknowledged that the baseline population estimates are based on more recent and intensive survey than those obtained from ESAS. However, the latter provide a means for assessing populations within the North Sea for all species considered and for different times of year. Further information on	**Appendix 11A, section 2.1.6** **Appendix 11A, section 7.7.7**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			Kubetzki et al. 2009 & Fort et al. 2012. Appendix 11A Ornithology Technical Report Section 4.3.33. Use of VMS data for sandeel fishery is useful but restricted to one of the main prey items; distribution of clupeids also is associated with several breeding seabirds and adult survival, eg puffin (Breton & Diamond 2013). Appendix 11A Ornithology Technical Report Section 4.3.40. Mortality rates presented for DBT represent the proportion of those birds predicted to be displaced that might be lost to the population. No attempt is made to assess this effect in relation to changes in background annual mortality and consequent population-level effects for relevant SPAs or more widely.		this can be found in Appendix 11A, Section 7.7.7 Table 4.5 in Appendix 11A Ornithology Technical Report has been updated with this information. Danish VMS data have been used in the population modelling as a proxy for the availability of sandeels. While it is acknowledged that the distribution of other prey species such as clupeids may also help explain the distributions of some seabird species, comparative data for other prey were not available for inclusion in the assessment. Further information on this is available in Appendix 11A Section 4.3.33 With respect to displacement, it is re-iterated that the mortality rates considered in this assessment represent the proportion of those birds predicted to be displaced that might be expected to be lost to the population in the long-term. No attempt is made to assess this effect in relation to changes in background annual mortality that	**Appendix 11A, table 4.5** **Appendix 11A, section 4.3.33** **Appendix 11A, section 4.3.40**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
					would be required to bring the population to the new lower equilibrium, as a number of uncertainties are likely to determine how long this will take to happen and thus the changes in annual mortality required. Further information on this can be found in Appendix 11A Section 4.3.40	
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	TS S42 Second Stage	20/12/2013	The use of Option 3. The main assessment is based on the extended Band model (2012), Option 3, and while some results for the basic model, Options 1 and 2, are presented in the further appendices (6,7 and 12), it would be preferable that they were referred to in the assessment (chapter11) and it's Technical Report (11A). Band (2012) explicitly states: "A collision risk assessment for a specific site should not be based solely on the use of generic data. Where generic data is used, it is recommended that the collision risk for three different options is stated. Supporting text should then discuss and justify which of the options is most likely to characterise the collision risks at this site." As such, while we welcome the tables presenting the range of options in appendix 6, we would prefer that full reference was made to them in the main assessment. The reference to a range of model options is crucially important, as the extended model and	Y	Discussion with regards to Collision Risk Modelling options and the appropriate avoidance rates to use within Collision Risk Modelling is ongoing. To inform this, a separate document (Forewind & SMartWind 2013) has been produced to provide a review of avoidance rates of seabirds at offshore wind farms and the applicability of their use within the Band collision risk model. Note is also made of the MROG Paper "Summary of current issues with Collision Risk Modelling approaches". As is noted in the comment, further work has been commissioned by Marine Scotland that should also better inform this issue. Further information on the Band 3 model can be found in Chapter 11	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			particularly it's associated source data and avoidance rates, is still in question and the subject of wide debate and on-going work across the SNCBs and offshore wind stakeholders. As such it should be considered a work in progress, and therefore not suitable for consideration alone in the consenting process. However, the RSPB acknowledge that it can provide useful contextual information for that consideration. Given these caveats with Option 3, Option 1 should also be presented throughout the document.			
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	TS S42 Second Stage	20/12/2013	The RSPB have outstanding concerns regarding flight height bands and confidence levels. Within the methods two additional types of data are described as being collected (Chapter 11A, para 2.1.6), but are not mentioned in any of the results. These are the recording of confidence levels alongside the height bands during boat based survey, and the use of an additional height band at 20-25m from December 2010. Both of these would have given very useful contextual information.	Y	Forewind noted the concerns raised by the RSPB regarding flight height bands and confidence levels and clarification has been added to the text. See Section 4 of Chapter 11 Appendix A,	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Appendix A, Section 4.**
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	TS S42 Second Stage	20/12/2013	The RSPB have outstanding concerns regarding flight height bands and confidence levels. Within the methods two additional types of data are described as being collected (Chapter 11A, para 2.1.6), but are not mentioned in any of the results. These are the recording of	Y	Forewind noted the concerns raised by the RSPB regarding flight height bands and confidence	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology,**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			confidence levels alongside the height bands during boat based survey, and the use of an additional height band at 20-25m from December 2010. Both of these would have given very useful contextual information. Ch 11 and App A-B: Marine and Coastal Ornithology: 4) Potential Biological Removal: Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is not appropriate for ascertaining sustainable levels of "harvest" (which we also consider a pejorative term in the context of this ES). The major concern is that PBR is unvalidated. PBR was developed for setting fishery bycatch limits, or for its application for setting hunting bag limits. PBR is predicated on a feedback loop to modify "harvesting" rates iteratively, if necessary. Once wind turbines are erected, there will be limited scope for modifying "take" if it is not sustainable. Overall, while PBR can be useful for assessment purposes to identify possible threats to seabirds from a particular human activity, uncertainties mitigate against its application in a management context to set levels of allowable loss from a population. This constraint derives directly from Article 5 of the Birds Directive (EU 2009) which requires Member States to take measures prohibiting the "deliberate killing or		levels and clarification has been added to the text. See Section 4 of Chapter 11 Appendix A, Forewind noted the concerns of NSRAC regarding Potential Biological Removal and has commissioned a study into the derivation of appropriate PBR values for the black-legged kittiwake and northern gannet populations of the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA. As well as providing justification for the parameters used in setting PBR values (including the use of appropriate recovery factors) the study provides a technical discussion on the theoretical basis of PBR and its use in respect of setting sustainable harvest levels in respect of seabird populations. More information on this topic can be found in Chapter 11	**Appendix A, Section 4.** **11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			capture [of birds] by any method". Legal guidance is that this is invoked even for activities where there is a prior presumption that mortality is likely to occur as a result of the activity, even if that activity does not deliberately set out to kill birds.			
North Sea Regional Advisory Council	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/01/2014	Ch 11 and App A-B: Marine and Coastal Ornithology: 1) Collision Risk: Although Option 1 with the same avoidance rates is appended, the use of Band Option 3 (aka the extended model) is not appropriate. Whilst this model may offer some advantages, these are more than countered by several fundamental problems: • The lack of empirical data to validate the collision risk model for seabirds. • Unknown error associated with flight height estimation during data gathering is compounded by the modelling to 1m bandwidths. • The 98% avoidance rate applied with Option 3 was originally calculated for Option 1. Our understanding is that the appropriate avoidance rate for Option 3 is likely to be lower as Option 3 already accounts for some of the incorporated variability. The extended model is the subject of considerable debate, which has prompted a review and further work, commissioned by Marine Scotland and due to deliver by the end of March 2014. The group carrying out this work includes	Y	Additional detail regarding the flight height modelling is provided in Johnston et al. (2014). Discussion with regards to Collision Risk Modelling options and the appropriate avoidance rates to use within Collision Risk Modelling is ongoing. To inform this, a separate document (Forewind and SmartWind 2013) has been produced to provide a review of avoidance rates of seabirds at offshore wind farms and the applicability of their use within the Band collision risk model. We also note the MROG Paper "Summary of current issues with Collision Risk Modelling approaches". As is noted, further work has been commissioned by Marine Scotland that should also better inform this issue. Further information on these issues can be found in Section 4, 5 and 6	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Section 4, 5 and 6**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			the BTO. Until this work is complete, Option 3 has to be considered to be "work in progress." • Collision risk predictions obtained from Option 3 are substantially lower than those obtained from Option 1, inappropriately so if a lower avoidance rate correction is applicable. • 99% avoidance rate for gannets is based on data primarily from bird's migrating/non-breeding season and may not apply to breeding birds. Given the current understanding for breeding seabirds, we consider the more precautionary avoidance rate of 98% should be applied as an indicative value for gannets (at least for the breeding season), as for other species, until empirical data improve the evidence base. Until there is a better evidential base for the collision risk model in general, and the extended Band model has been peer-reviewed, in combination with the calculation of an appropriate avoidance rate, we are unhappy with the application of Option 3 alone. Currently, we suggest that the assessment should use either Option 1 and 98%, thereby facilitating cumulative impact assessment, or present both Options 3 and 1 across a range of avoidance rates. We acknowledge that Option 1 has been presented, in an appendix, but not carried forward into the assessment.		Discussion with regards to Collision Risk Modelling options and the appropriate avoidance rates to use within Collision Risk Modelling is ongoing. To inform this, a separate document (Forewind and SmartWind 2013) has been produced to provide a review of avoidance rates of seabirds at offshore wind farms and the applicability of their use within the Band collision risk model. We also note the MROG Paper "Summary of current issues with Collision Risk Modelling approaches". As is noted, further work has been commissioned by Marine Scotland that should also better inform this issue. The valuable work of CEH in understanding the potential impacts on demography of displacement and barrier effects is acknowledged. Further discussion of the likely impacts associated with displacement is provided in an independent	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Section 4, 5 and 6** **11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Section 4, 5 and 6**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			Ch 11 and App A-B: Marine and Coastal Ornithology: 2) Gannet Avoidance Rates: The assessment is based on the use of a generic avoidance rate of 98%, with 99% for gannet. While the use of 98% is supported in the text by reference to guidance (SNH, 2010) and a review (Cook et al, 2012), the use of 99% for gannet is not, nor is it justified in the supporting text, except by reference to the Triton Knoll application. It is our position that 98% should remain the default avoidance rate for gannet, as stated in SNH (2010) and Cook et al (2012) until empirical evidence is available to justify a change applicable to breeding as well as non-breeding seasons. Ch 11 and App A-B: Marine and Coastal Ornithology: 3) Displacement & Barrier Effects: The additive mortality arising from displacement and barriers is unknown (CEH displacement study, Forth & Tay, Searle et al. in prep.). Reduced breeding productivity is most likely to be the proximate effect of displacement/barriers, for adult seabirds. Whilst expecting that generally long-lived adults will abandon a breeding attempt to safeguard their own survival to make another breeding attempt in another year, there may be consequences for body condition into the winter and knock-on effects for overwinter		review (Furness 2013),	

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			survival, as borne out by the CEH work. CEH individual based models indicate that effects on adult and chick survival increased when the distance between the SPA colony and wind farm were smallest, and the main effect driving survival was the cost of the barrier effect rather than displacement per se. The CEH study is a preliminary, but valuable, step in improving our understanding of displacement and barrier effects. In presenting the matrices of displacement x mortality, at least the relative sensitivity for each species can be assessed, although the matrices in Appendix 10 present predictions for the whole year, rather than distinguishing breeding/non-breeding totals			
North Sea Regional Advisory Council	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/01/2014	Ch 11 and App A-B: Marine and Coastal Ornithology: 4) Potential Biological Removal: Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is not appropriate for ascertaining sustainable levels of “harvest” (which we also consider a pejorative term in the context of this ES). The major concern is that PBR is unvalidated. PBR was developed for setting fishery bycatch limits, or for its application for setting hunting bag limits. PBR is predicated on a feedback loop to modify “harvesting” rates iteratively, if necessary. Once wind turbines are erected, there will be limited scope for modifying “take” if it is not sustainable.	Y	Forewind noted the concerns of NSRAC regarding Potential Biological Removal and has commissioned a study into the derivation of appropriate PBR values for the black-legged kittiwake and northern gannet populations of the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA. As well as providing justification for the parameters used in setting PBR values (including the use of appropriate recovery factors) the study provides a technical discussion on the theoretical basis of PBR and its use in	**11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			Overall, while PBR can be useful for assessment purposes to identify possible threats to seabirds from a particular human activity, uncertainties mitigate against its application in a management context to set levels of allowable loss from a population. This constraint derives directly from Article 5 of the Birds Directive (EU 2009) which requires Member States to take measures prohibiting the "deliberate killing or capture [of birds] by any method". Legal guidance is that this is invoked even for activities where there is a prior presumption that mortality is likely to occur as a result of the activity, even if that activity does not deliberately set out to kill birds.		respect of setting sustainable harvest levels in respect of seabird populations. More information on this topic can be found in Chapter 11	
12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology						
Tees Valley RIGS	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/12/2013	Tees Valley RIGS concerns are with regards to the Red Howles Site at cable landfall. 'The Red Howles Site was identified and assessed during 2012/2013 and considered worthy of RIGS status for two reasons. It is one of a small number of outcrops of the Calcareous Shale Member of the Redcar Mudstone Formation. The outcrop also illustrates the presence of an articlinal structure between Red Howles and Redcar Rocks. The Red Howles RIGS site is included in the Redcar & Cleveland Council draft Local Plan out for consultation at present.	Y	Forewind noted the comments received from Tees Valley RIGS and the concern highlighted over the Red Howles site at the landfall. Forewind recognises the potential for accidental damage during construction and has reduced the size of temporary working areas around the landfall to mitigate this. Further information on this change can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description	**05 Project description**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			The Purpose of the designation of the Red Howles site is to protect it from damage. From the information provided by you it appears that the site is not directly affected by your landfall proposals. It would be desirable that positive measure be taken during construction to ensure that accidental damage does not occur from heavy equipment or any other actions'.			
Redcar Fishermen's Association	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/12/2013	A meeting with fishermen from Redcar to update them on the Teesside A & B projects. Commercial fisheries baseline, fish ecology studies and impact assessments were discussed as well as mitigation measures on installation of the cables. Forewind suggested that community group meetings would be a good idea, as well as early warning of surveys and operational works.	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further information on marine ecology can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology	**12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	13/12/2013	A second meeting with the Hartlepool fishermen that was held to discuss the Teesside projects with the fishermen. An overview of commercial fisheries, fish ecology and impact assessments was given. Forewind highlighted that working group meetings would be a good idea and that Forewind will endeavour to provide all fishermen with early warning of surveys or operations. The fishermen believe that the impacts on themselves are major as opposed to minor or moderate	Y	Forewind noted the comments received during the meeting, further information on Marine and intertidal ecology can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology	**12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
The Wildlife Trusts	TS S42 Second Stage	20/12/2013	It is of the opinion of the Wildlife Trust that Dogger Bank Teesside A&B should not be a permanent development and so at the end of its life, all traces of hard substrate should be removed, whether or not they have formed the basis for new and different seabed communities. The Wildlife Trust request to be consulted upon assessing decommissioning options in the short, medium and long term.	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from the Wildlife Trusts and that the development should not be a permanent installation. Further information on this topic can be found in Section 8 and further information on decommissioning can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description, Section 6.7	**12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 8 05 Project Description, Section 6.7**
North Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	To reduce sediment loading in the water column as a result of dredging operations and subsequent transport and deposition in areas outside of the cable corridor, the developer should seek to infill trenches as soon as possible following dredging and laying of cable.	Y	Forewind has noted the comments from North Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority concerning infilling of trenches as soon as possible after laying cables. The option of trenching and infilling as a single activity is included with the ES, more information on which can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description, Section 3.9	**05 Project description, Section 3.9**
13 Fish and Shellfish						
TS_2nd Stage S47_R1	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/11/2013	A letter from a resident stating that they support the project on the basis that it will reduce fishing and be a positive impact on offshore ecology and fish.	N	Forewind noted the letter from the resident and the positive comments	**13 Fish and Shellfish**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP / New Under Ten metre Fishermen's	TS s47 Non-present Second	29/11/2013	An email from EPIC Regeneration Consultants, confirming they are pulling together information on the Draft ES for a response. Additional data from the	Y	Forewind noted the email from EPIC and recorded the information within, including the data provided. Forewind also	**13 Fish and Shellfish**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
Association (NUFTA) / Precision Marine Survey Limited	Stage		Hartlepool Fishermen's Society was sent through to Forewind, including an analysis of group landings, turnover, and numbers of days at sea from January 2007 to May 2013. Also included was a paper on the impact of rock armouring on nephrons populations.		noted the paper on rock armouring. An assessment of impacts of hard substrates on fish and shellfish ecology can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology in Section 7.7	
Norwegian Fishermen's Association	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	03/12/2013	A meeting with members of the Norwegian Fishermen's Organisation. The meeting was to update the fishermen on the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B projects ahead of the PEI3 submission and answer any questions they may have. The main topics of discussion were Fish and Shellfish, Commercial fishing, project infrastructure and mitigation measures. The minutes for the meeting were sent out post-PEI3. At the meeting, the fishermen would likely not continue to fish within the wind farm	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further information on fish and shellfish can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish	**13 Fish and Shellfish**
Redcar Fishermen's Association	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/12/2013	A meeting with fishermen from Redcar to update them on the Teesside A & B projects. Commercial fisheries baseline, fish ecology studies and impact assessments were discussed as well as mitigation measures on installation of the cables. Forewind suggested that community group meetings would be a good idea, as well as early warning of surveys and operational works.	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further information on fish and shellfish can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish	**13 Fish and Shellfish**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second	13/12/2013	A second meeting with the Hartlepool fishermen that was held to discuss the Teesside projects with the fishermen. An overview of commercial fisheries, fish	Y	Forewind noted the comments received during the meeting, further information on fish and shellfish can be found in Chapter	**13 Fish and Shellfish**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
	Stage		ecology and impact assessments was given. Forewind highlighted that working group meetings would be a good idea and that Forewind will endeavour to provide all fishermen with early warning of surveys or operations. The fishermen believe that the impacts on themselves are major as opposed to minor or moderate		13 Fish and Shellfish	
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	The inshore element of the Export Cable Corridor shows an area of the highest concentration over a known Nephrops habitat. Concerned that so little is understood about the impact of EMF and heating effects from HVDC cabling on commercial fish stocks and any potential for EMF to create barriers to fish stock migration. Request for further information on the use of bundling of cables to mitigate the effects of EMF on receptors. Request further information on the research undertaken by Bochert and Zettler, (2004) as cited. Lack of seabed samples inadequate given	Y	Forewind noted the comments and the importance of Nephrops in inshore areas is noted in Table 4.6 in Section 4.6 Forewind noted the comments and a review of EMF impacts and its effects are provided in Section 7.10 - 7.1`2 and Chapter 5 Project Description, Section 3 Forewind noted the comments and text to clarify the bundling of cables has been added in Section 3.3 and Section 7.10 Forewind noted the comments and text to clarify the highlighted research has been added in Section 7.11	**13 Fish and Shellfish, Table 4.6** **13 Fish and Shellfish, Section 7.10 - 7.12** **05 Project Description, Section 3** **13 Fish and Shellfish, Section 3.3 and 7.10** **13 Fish and Shellfish, Section 7.11**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			there are previously used spoil dumping areas in proximity.		Forewind noted the comments and contaminant concentrations along the cable corridor are described in Section 6.6.4	**13 Fish and Shellfish, Section 6.6.4**
14 Marine Mammals						
Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/12/2013	Monopile, or pin pile, foundations should not be used, Further assessments are made on alternative foundations to fully understand the potential impacts on marine mammals, and prey species; That a robust impact monitoring strategy (Marine Mammal Monitoring Plan) is developed for the range of species that can reasonably be impacted and a report provided within a reasonable timeframe; EPS "Section 2.2, referring to the EPS Guidance, it is noted that SCANS II surveys have been used to estimate populations for commonly occurring cetaceans species in the UK. However,	Y	Piled foundations are included in this assessment as the worst case scenario for marine mammals with regard to foundation installation within the Rochdale Envelope approach. Monopiles are currently the most economic and widely used foundation used in the offshore wind industry, Forewind therefore needs to retain flexibility of foundation types to ensure the most feasible and economic project can be built. It should be noted that the assessment considered other receptors where non-piled foundations may represent worst case . Using the Rochdale Envelope approach assessments are made of alternate worst case foundation alternative for marine mammal prey species in Chapter 13. The results of this assessment are	**14 Marine Mammals, Section 6.5, 7.7, 8.6 and 10**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			SCANS surveys are run 10 years apart and only give a snapshot of cetacean abundance and cannot be relied upon to give abundance and distribution numbers". Pile driving "Noise levels during construction remains a key concern with the other proposed foundations and, as a very minimum, should be monitored. All noise modelling should be ground-truthed". "We note that the maximum construction period For Teesside A & B would be 11 years and 6 months (section 5.2.1). If this occurs after the construction of Dogger Bank Creyke Beck, which has a maximum construction period of 6 years (Dogger Bank Creyke Beck Draft Environmental Statement, section 5.2.1, Forewind 2013) this would result in a maximum 18 years of piling activity, and that marine mammals would be excluded from the site for the duration of the pile-driving". "We recommend that the same consideration is given to marine mammals when the second pile-driving occurs as is given to the first and that it is not assumed that animals have moved out of the area		then used in Section 6.5, 7.7, 8.6 and Section 10. Forewind is committed to producing a MMMP and confirm that should site impact monitoring be deemed appropriate they will develop a monitoring plan in conjunction with Regulators and SNCBs. The EPS Guidance JNCC et al. (2010a) cites the SCANS II data as the best data to estimate population size of these species of cetacean. The limitations of these data are acknowledged in the ES (Section 2.2), and their used has been agreed with JNCC and Natural England during consultation. It is expected that measurement of noise during construction will be a requirement of the DCO. Construction at Dogger Bank Teesside A & B could take up to 11 years and 6 months (Section 5.2). Construction at Dogger Bank Creyke Beck A & B could also take up to 11 years and 6 months (Forewind, 2013). However, all four projects are constrained to	**14 Marine Mammals, Section 2.2**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			as pile driving has already commenced elsewhere".		start construction no sooner than 18 months and within seven years of consent (Para 5.2.1). Therefore the latest construction finish on a project will be 13 years after consent award. In the CIA it has been assumed that Dogger Bank Teesside A & B consent is awarded six months after Creyke Beck A &B, and consent for Dogger Bank Teesside C & D will be awarded two years after Dogger Bank Creyke Beck A & B. Therefore, the maximum period over which construction can occur would be 13 years and six months. See Section 6.3 of Chapter 5. Multiple pile driving at Dogger Bank Teesside A & B is assessed in Section 6.1. Consideration of the potential impacts two concurrent piling vessels, and therefore multiple pile driving across each project, is given throughout the assessment using the 'footprint' approach. The assessment considers the worst case of the impacts across each project area prior to any movement out of the area as a result of other pile driving events.	**14 Marine Mammals, Section 5.3, paragraph 5.2.1** **05 Project Description, Section 6.3** **14 Marine Mammals, Section 6.1**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/12/2013	"We note that the methodology used by Southall have been used in underwater noise modelling. The limitations of the methodology used by Southall are acknowledged in the Southall paper itself, and they are extensive." Monitoring "…. we note that in section 3.2.3 that the boat based surveys were conducted "between January 2010 and June 2012" the duration of this survey is not adequate to build up a picture of the use of the development area, and potential impact area, by cetaceans. We acknowledge that the data is collected and used in conjunction with other surveys (the limitations of some are noted above). We recommend a minimum of 2 years of boat based surveys, although preferably 5". "Section 3.2.3 also states that the methodology used to survey marine mammals "followed the methodology of Camphuysen et al. (2004)". However this methodology was designed for surveying seabirds in relation to offshore wind farms. We are concerned this methodology was used as it is not designed for marine mammal surveying". Mitigation "Soft start of pile driving has not been proven and so mitigation out to 700	Y	The methods used for underwater noise modelling following the approach agreed in consultation for Dogger Bank Creyke Beck A & B (Forewind, 2013). A total of 29 months of site specific boat based surveys were completed, along with 33 months of aerial surveys between May 2009 and July 2012 (Section 3.2). Other regional data sets were also used to characterise use of the area by cetaceans. The data were not limited to two years. Site specific aerial survey data were used in the impact assessment. This approach was agreed for Dogger Bank Creyke Beck A & B in consultation with JNCC (Forewind, 2013). The boat based surveys following the Camphuysen et al. (2004) methodology were not used in the impact assessment. The Hi-Def aerial survey data (Appendix 14B) were used in the impact assessment following the approach agreed for Dogger Bank Creyke Beck A & B in consultation with JNCC (Forewind, 2013) As stated in Para 6.1.63 Forewind	**14 Marine Mammals, Section 3.2** **Appendix 14B**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			metres must be in place for prevention of injury. Real-time mitigation measures should include acoustic barrier methods and other techniques that have been proved in recent studies - Wilke 2012 and Diederichs et al., 2013" Cumulative assessment "It is clear that the cumulative assessment has taken into account other offshore wind farms in UK waters alongside both Teesside applications; however we are concerned that the potential impacts have not been scaled up as it has been assumed that marine mammals will have already left the area. Of particular concern is the cumulative impacts of Dogger Bank Teesside A & B being constructed after Dogger Bank Creyke Beck as described above' we feel this should be given greater consideration". Operation "Section 7 – Whilst it is anticipated that operational noise levels will be much lower than construction noise, there is no data available on operational noise impacts on marine mammals so a long-term monitoring plan should incorporate operational noise impacts on cetaceans".		will, if deemed appropriate at the time of development of the MMMP, extend the mitigation zone to prevent the possibility of instantaneous PTS occurring in all species for the maximum hammer energy. The MMMP will be developed in consultation with JNCC and Natural England. The assessment does not assume that marine mammals have left the area, the assessment considers impacts following no redistribution of animals, as stated above and in Section 6.1. Observational data on operation noise from wind turbines do exist, as cited in Section 7.1. However, Forewind confirm that should site impact monitoring be deemed appropriate they will develop a monitoring plan in conjunction with Regulators and SNCBs.	**14 Marine Mammals, paragraph 6.1.63** **14 Marine Mammals, Section 6.1** **14 Marine Mammals, Section 7.1**
Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society	TS s47 Non-present Second	12/12/2013	WDC note that the maximum construction period For Teesside A & B would be 11 years and 6 months (section 5.2.1). If this occurs after the construction of Dogger	Y	Construction at Dogger Bank Teesside A & B could take up to 11 years and 6 months. Construction at Dogger Bank	**05 Project Description,**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
	Stage		Bank Creyke Beck, which has a maximum construction period of 6 years (Dogger Bank Creyke Beck Draft Environmental Statement, section 5.2.1, Forewind 2013) this would result in a maximum 18 years of piling activity, and that marine mammals would be excluded from the site for the duration of the pile-driving. WDC has concerns with the use of SCANS II surveys for the purpose of assessing populations. Soft-start of pile driving has not been proven and so mitigation out to 700 metres must be in place for prevention of injury. Real-time mitigation measures should include acoustic barrier methods and other techniques that have been proved in recent studies.		Creyke Beck A & B could also take up to 11 years and 6 months. However, all four projects are constrained to start construction no sooner than 18 months and within seven years of consent. Therefore the latest construction finish on a project will be 13 years after consent is awarded. In the CIA it is assumed that Dogger Bank Teesside A & B consent is awarded 6 months after Creyke Beck A & B, and consent for Dogger Bank Teesside C & D will be awarded two years after Dogger Bank Creyke Beck A & B. Therefore, the maximum period over which construction can occur would be 13 years and six months. See Section 6.3 of Chapter 5. The EPS Guidance JNCC et al. (2010a) cites the SCANS II data as the best data to estimate population size of these species of cetacean. The limitations of these data are acknowledged in the ES (Section 2.2), and their used has been agreed with JNCC and Natural England during consultation. As stated in Section 6.1.63	**Section 6.3** **14 Marine Mammals, Section 2.2**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
					Forewind will, if deemed appropriate at the time of development of the MMMP, extend the mitigation zone to prevent the possibility of all instantaneous PTS occurring in all species for the maximum hammer energy. The MMMP will be developed in consultation with JNCC and Natural England.	**14 Marine Mammals, Section 6.1.63**
The Wildlife Trusts	TS S42 Second Stage	20/12/2013	"The Wildlife Trusts believe that comprehensive monitoring is required to test the assumptions of the assessment), so that mitigation measures can be adapted in response to any impacts that are greater than anticipated, and our collective understanding of the response of harbour porpoise to piling can be increased." "The Wildlife Trust also suggests that the developers work collaboratively with other developers to devise and deliver monitoring strategies so that lessons can be learnt and comparisons made." "The Wildlife Trust request the opportunity to feed into the development of the cetacean monitoring programme to provide reassurance that significant impacts, if they occur can be identified at an early stage and appropriate mitigation applied."	Y	Forewind confirm that should site impact monitoring be deemed appropriate they will develop a monitoring plan in conjunction with Regulators and SNCBs. Forewind are committed to collaborative projects on monitoring and mitigation methods including the ORJIP initiative, and DEPONS project. Any impact monitoring programme will be developed in consultation with the Regulators and SNCBs responsible for sign off of the MMMP. It is expected that the Wildlife Trust will consult with the SNCBs as required.	**14 Marine Mammals**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
15 Commercial Fisheries						
TS_2nd Stage S47_R1	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	12/11/2013	A letter from a resident stating that they support the project on the basis that it will reduce fishing and be a positive impact on offshore ecology and fish.	N	Forewind noted the letter from the resident and the positive comments	**15 Commercial Fisheries**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP / New Under Ten metre Fishermen's Association (NUFTA) / Precision Marine Survey Limited	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	29/11/2013	An email from EPIC Regeneration Consultants, confirming they are pulling together information on the Draft ES for a response. Additional data from the Hartlepool Fishermen's Society was sent through to Forewind, including an analysis of group landings, turnover, and numbers of days at sea from January 2007 to May 2013. Also included was a paper on the impact of rock armouring on nephrons populations.	Y	Forewind noted the email from EPIC and recorded the information within, including the data provided. Forewind also noted the paper on rock armouring. An assessment of impacts of hard substrates on fish and shellfish ecology can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology in Section 7.7	**15 Commercial Fisheries**
Norwegian Fishermen's Association	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	03/12/2013	A meeting with members of the Norwegian Fishermen's Organisation. The meeting was to update the fishermen on the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B projects ahead of the PEI3 submission and answer any questions they may have. The main topics of discussion were Fish and Shellfish, Commercial fishing, project infrastructure and mitigation measures. The minutes for the meeting were sent out post-PEI3. At the meeting, the fishermen would likely not continue to fish within the wind farm	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further information on commercial fishing can be found in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries	**15 Commercial Fisheries**
Redcar Fishermen's Association	TS s47 Non-	12/12/2013	A meeting with fishermen from Redcar to update them on the Teesside A & B	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the meeting, further	**15 Commercial Fisheries**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
	present Second Stage		projects. Commercial fisheries baseline, fish ecology studies and impact assessments were discussed as well as mitigation measures on installation of the cables. Forewind suggested that community group meetings would be a good idea, as well as early warning of surveys and operational works.		information on commercial fishing can be found in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries	
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	13/12/2013	A second meeting with the Hartlepool fishermen that was held to discuss the Teesside projects with the fishermen. An overview of commercial fisheries, fish ecology and impact assessments was given. Forewind highlighted that working group meetings would be a good idea and that Forewind will endeavour to provide all fishermen with early warning of surveys or operations. The fishermen believe that the impacts on themselves are major as opposed to minor or moderate	Y	Forewind noted the comments received during the meeting, further information on commercial fisheries can be found in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries	**15 Commercial Fisheries**
Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes et des Elevages Marins du Nord/Pas de Calais/Picardie (CRPMEM)	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	CRPMEM highlight that it is difficult to say if the impact of the Dogger Bank Teesside A&B export cable corridor installation and decommissioning will be discernible or not. This is due to complex factors influencing fishing strategies including; fishing strategies, attribution of quota and the presence/absence of species not managed by EU quota with high value. CRPMEM highlight that displaced fishermen may re-locate to already exploited areas resulting in an increase of fishing density on fewer and smaller areas. CRPMEM suggest to be in contact	Y	Forewind noted the comments received by CPRMEM and will continue ongoing liaison with them	**15 Commercial Fisheries**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			with CRPMEM before and during the installation and decommissioning of the export cable to assure a good coordination between cable works and the French fishing activity.			
North Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	NEIFCA notes that inshore vessels less than 15m are often overlooked in commercial fisheries impact assessments and NEIFCA encourages the applicant to appoint a fisheries liaison officer for the duration of the project to establish dialogue with local fishermen, obtain a more accurate picture of the inshore fishing landscape and ensure that industry related concerns are addresses. The potting industry has already been subject to displacement due to EDF Teesside windfarm. To minimise gear displacement and disruption to the potting industry, it would be prudent to conduct the construction stage of inshore cable route outside of the main potting season which runs between May and October. NEIFCA suggest that efforts are made to limit cable armouring that may pose an obstruction to mobile gear activities. Where armouring is necessary, materials that encourage sediment deposition, such as concrete mattresses with integrated frond mats should be used.	Y	Figure 8.14 and 8.16 of Appendix 15A show landings values and effort (days fished) by vessel category and is utilised to detail the extent of fishing grounds for the under 15m fleet. Also section 8.4 of Appendix 15A details fishing grounds and vessel specifications as depicted by local fishermen through consultation. Forewind have maintained a local fisheries liaison officer to ensure well maintained dialogue with local fishermen. Consultation is ongoing with local potting fishermen to minimise disruption. Cables will be buried where feasible and where burial is not feasible, will be protected and will endeavour to be designed to be over trawlable.	**Appendix 15A, Figure 8.14 and 8.16. Section 8.4**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-	20/12/2013	Section 4 of Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries contains no reference to the	Y	Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
	present Second Stage		inshore environment, nor that of the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B Export Cable Corridor, focusing purely on the main turbine construction area. Fig 4.5 of Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries (surveillance sightings) is reliant on overflights, which do not take place every day. Individual and group trawl plots for HFS members show a much greater trawl effort along the inshore element of the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B Export Cable Corridor than the overflight data suggests Para 4.4.1 of Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries - Fishing values and activity may well be low in the actual array zone, but this is not the case for the inshore element of the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B Export Cable Corridor. There is also no reference to otter trawling inshore around the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B Export Cable Corridor landfall area. HFS members pursue a truly mixed fishery. Inshore potters and crabbers in this area do not, by and large, use small mesh pots and cages and therefore land very few Nephrops – their catch is predominantly lobsters and crabs, with some fin fish as		concerning no reference to inshore environment, more information on this can be found in Section 4.1 Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning trawl plots, the Hartlepool Fishermen's Society trawl plots were not available at the time of writing. Further detail on this can be found in paragraph 4.4.1 and 8.1 and in Appendix 15A Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning fishing values and otter trawling, further information on this can be found in section 4.4.1 Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning, further information can be found in sections 4.5.3, 4.5.15 and 8.1.2, as well as Appendix 15A Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning inshore potters equipment, further information on this can be found in section 4.5.9	**4,1** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 4.4.1 and 8.1 Appendix 15A** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 4.4.1** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 4.5.3, 4.5.15 and 8.1.2 Appendix 15A** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 4.5.9**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			by-catch. The effort for the inshore area is greater because skippers are required to spend more days at sea to land sufficient catch to make a living. Nephrops fishing activity may be moderate on a national scale but accounts for 60% of the value of landings made by HFS members If the inshore element has to be protected using either rock armour or concrete mattresses due to the presence of igneous rock substrates and outcrops that prevent trenching then the loss of fishing grounds to under 10m trawlers will be for at least the operational lifespan of the wind farm plus the decommissioning period. The worst case scenario for cable protection where burial is not feasible is the use of concrete mattressing, causing a risk of snagging gear. Snagging risks are much greater for small fishing vessels as they do not have the horsepower or winch equipment to pull free of snags in the way that larger fishing boats have. Inshore fishermen are restricted by the safe distances that boats can travel from their home port, and weather and tidal		Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning extended time at sea, further information on this can be found in section 4.5.10 Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning the level of Nephrops fishing in the area, further information on this can be found in section 3.3.10 Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning mitigation measures. Forewind will continue to discuss this aspect of the project with relevant fisheries stakeholders, and further information this can be found in section 8.2.14 Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning cable protection, further information on this topic can be found in Table 5.1 Forewind noted the comments from EPIC Regeneration concerning safe distance restrictions, further information on this can be found in section 6.1.4	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 4.5.10** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 3.3.10** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 8.2.14** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Table 5.1** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 6.1.4**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			constraints.			
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	The worst case scenario for cable protection where burial is not feasible is the use of concrete mattressing, causing a risk of snagging gear. Snagging risks are much greater for small fishing vessels as they do not have the horsepower or winch equipment to pull free of snags in the way that larger fishing boats have. Inshore fishermen are restricted by the safe distances that boats can travel from their home port, and weather and tidal constraints. EPIC Regeneration have concerns regarding inshore cable protection and the loss of fishing grounds to under 10m trawlers will be for at least the operational lifespan of the wind farm plus the decommissioning period. The sensitivity of the Nephrops fishery should be high- the same as the potting fishery. Impacts of HVDC cable on migratory and commercial fish species, particularly Nephrops. Concerns that measures deemed to be 'over-fishable' by over 15m vessels are	Y	Forewind noted the concerns raised by EPIC Regeneration in regards to snagging risks. See Chapter 15, Table 5.1. Concerns are noted by Forewind. This is addressed within Chapter 15, Section 6.1.4. Addressed in Forewind noted the concerns of EPIC Regeneration and this aspect will be discussed further with relevant fisheries stakeholders. See Chapter 15 paragraph 8.2.14. This comment has been addressed in Chapter 15, Section 6.2.27, 6.2.30, 6.2.35 and Figure 6.18. Concerns are noted by Forewind. See Section 7.10 of Chapter 13 within the Environmental Statement. Forewind noted the concerns highlighted by EPIC Regeneration and this aspect will be discussed with relevant fisheries stakeholders.	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Table 5.1** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 6.1.4** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 8.2.14** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Sections 6.2.27, 6.2.30, 6.2.35 and Figure 6.18** **13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Section 7.10**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			not necessarily so by smaller inshore vessels, and may therefore impede normal fishing activities to a very significant extent. EPIC Regeneration strongly contest the notion that existing projects, activities and plans are considered to be part of the existing baseline and are therefore not included in the cumulative assessments. The location of Dogger Bank C&D export cable. Rock armouring and concrete mattresses present significant marine hazards to smaller fishing vessels, creating de facto no-trawl areas.		Forewind noted the comment from EPIC Regeneration regarding the Cumulative Impact Assessment. See Section 11.1.10 of Chapter 15 within the Environmental Statement for further information. Forewind noted the concerns regarding the location of Dogger Bank Teesside C & D export cable corridor. The concerns raised by EPIC Regeneration regarding rock armouring and marine hazards are noted by Forewind and addressed in Chapter 15, Section 8.2.14. This will also be discussed further with the relevant fisheries stakeholders.	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 11.1.10** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 8.2.14**
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	11: Para 11.1.10 - We would strongly contest the notion that existing projects, activities and plans are considered to be part of the existing baseline and are therefore not included in the cumulative assessment. two new developments have been introduced (the Breagh pipeline and the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm) which have reduced our clients' ability to fish on traditional grounds – not only through the actual loss of area covered by these developments, but also	Y	The Forewind CIA strategy is detailed in Chapter 4 Appendix A of the Environmental Statement. The strategy follows the Guiding Principles for Cumulative Effects Assessment that were produced by RenewableUK and endorsed by the Offshore Renewable Energy Licensing Group (ORELG). As noted by EPIC Regeneration, operational projects are considered to already	**04 EIA Process, Appendix A**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			due to the previously mentioned unintended loss caused by the displacement of shipping anchorages. Whilst the cumulative impact of the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm is mentioned, there is no reference to the Breagh pipeline. 11: Para 11.1.10 - It is essential that you consider the cumulative impact of any development and growth plans for Teesport, particularly where these will lead to either an increase in the volume of shipping or the average tonnage of vessels using the port. 11: Fig 11.2 - : The second cable corridor marked on the map cuts through some of the most profitable fishing grounds remaining to our clients. We would therefore suggest that the cumulative impact of the construction, operation, and decommissioning of Dogger Bank A & B, when taken together with Dogger Bank C & D; the Breagh pipeline; the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm; and the increasing number and tonnage of ships using Teesport will be severely adverse for Hartlepool's inshore trawler fleet, particularly if either Hartlepool or Teesport are selected as construction and		be impacting the existing environment. In line with the Forewind CIA strategy, operational projects are therefore considered as part of the baseline and are not taken through to the Cumulative Impact Assessment. At the time of carrying out the assessments the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm was in construction and therefore included in the cumulative impact assessment, whereas the Breagh pipeline was operational and already deemed to be part of the existing baseline. Due to the limited information available on port and shipping developments in the future the NRA considers a set 10% (in the case of Dogger Teesside) to assess a future case traffic level. So we have undertaken a future case assessment demonstrating what traffic will look like but without being specific as to where that traffic may or may not come from. It is acknowledged that the Dogger Bank Teesside C & D Export Cable passes through the most important Nephrops grounds	

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			maintenance ports. 11: Para 11.5.5, 11.5.7 to 11.5.9 - Figure 11.7 indicates that the demersal mobile gear value for the A & B Export Cable Corridor is, in fact, high in the inshore area and medium to high for the proposed route of the C & D corridor, not low to moderate as this paragraph states. Our comments on the magnitude of effect for our clients, as stated previously, stand.		for the Hartlepool fleet. However, as with the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B export cable corridor, the loss of fishing area during the construction phase is less than 3% of the total grounds available. The total loss of fishing area in the event that Dogger Bank Teesside A & B and Dogger Bank Teesside C & D are constructed at the same time would less than 5%. Therefore, the HFS members would retain over 90% of their traditional fishing grounds available and as such the cumulative impacts assessments are considered to be valid. Section 11.5 of Chapter 15 has been amended to reflect additional information provided by fishermen during consultation. However, Forewind has followed current standard EIA practice in assessing impacts at a fishing fleet level, and therefore the impacts assessed are valid. It is appreciated that impacts assessed on a fishing fleet or wider regional level may not reflect the impacts at the individual fisherman level, and as such Forewind are committed to	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 11.5**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
					continued liaison to further identify and reduce where feasible impacts at a smaller level and as such Forewind are committed to continued liaison with individual fishermen.	
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	4: Fig 4.7 - This figure does not accurately represent the extent of the HFS fishing grounds – an amended copy is attached for information. Please note that listing P Walsh as the data source for this map (and a number of others) is incorrect, as he was working in Amble on the date listed, and the location and area of the trawl surveys undertaken by the Walsh Brothers with PMSL were largely directed by Nigel Proctor. It is also important to state at this point that producing maps which use Ordnance Survey grids instead of latitudes and longitudes, and which have no markers for key on-shore locations, make it exceptionally difficult for skippers to compare EIA maps with their own or Admiralty charts. This is not fair and needs to be rectified in the final version. Figure 11.10: We are frankly astonished that the source of information for this map comes from Marine Scotland rather than the MMO. The areas listed as being of	Y	Members of the Hartlepool fishing community attended a consultation meeting with Forewind on 22nd May 2013 and provided information on general fishing areas by drawing on charts provided. These data are represented in Figure 4.7 of Chapter 15. The comments regarding the use of Ordinance Survey maps has been noted and efforts will be made in future consultation meetings to overlay project plans of Admiralty charts, however charts need to follow a format that is identifiable by all stakeholders. Admiralty charts were available for fishermen to identify fishing areas at consultation meetings and it has been assumed that fishermen are able to identify fishing grounds from prominent landmarks in the charts. Admiralty charts with Dogger Bank Teesside A & B and Dogger Bank Teesside C & D Export Cable Corridors overlain have been	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Figure 4.7**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			high value are the Farne Deeps and the Silver Pit, and are only fished by the Scottish (and Irish) prawn fleets about every 5 years, when they have fished out their own grounds and come south with the aim of fishing these two locations until there are no adult prawns left. Landings data from the MMO, and information from the Cefas Environmentally Responsible Fishing (ERF)project, support the assertion that there is a strong and valuable inshore prawn fishery located in the path of both the proposed Export Cable Corridors. This map needs to be significantly amended to incorporate this information, as per the ERF VMS map previously sent to Forewinds.		issued to Epic Regeneration, acting on behalf of the Hartlepool Fishermen's Society, to facilitate this. Forewind acknowledge the comments made by EPIC Regeneration and note that VMS data from Marine Scotland is used as a proxy for under 10m vessels. See Section 11.5.8 of Chapter 15.	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 11.5.8**
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	It is not clear from the data representation of fishing activity derived from VMS what density of VMS means. Measures to minimise or mitigate for the potential loss of access to the project areas are not sufficiently well defined. An appropriate scheme of mitigation for seine netting should be defined. NFFO want to work towards achieving coexistence. The ability of fisheries to continue within the sites during construction, operation and decommissioning should be assessed. We acknowledge that publically available	Y	Forewind noted that the clarity of density of VMS is required, further information on this can be found in Section 3.2.9 Forewind will consult with relative fisheries representatives to determine a co-existence plan, further information on this topic can be found in Section 9.7 Forewind noted the comments concerning continuation of fishing during various stages of the project, further information on this can be found in Table 3.3 and Table 3.4, which explain the	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 3.2.9** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 9.7** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Table 3.3 and Table 3.4**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			data sources do not allow assessments to take into account the degree to which the individual fishing grounds of particular fishing businesses are affected. The ES should clearly acknowledge at relevant points in the document that individual fishing businesses may be affected to greater levels than are possible to be assessed due to data limitations The cumulative impact assessment upon fisheries does not currently address proposed management measures for fisheries within the Dogger Bank SAC. We would expect this to represent a significant additional impact upon fishing activity in the area.		criteria used for assessment of impacts Forewind noted the comments concerning data availability, requests for additional, higher resolution data have been sent to Dutch, Danish & UK fisheries representatives. Further information on this topic can be found in section 3.3.10 Forewind noted the comment concerning cumulative impacts, SAC is considered within Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries and charted within baseline figure 6.3. Management measures have yet to be agreed, and further information on this topic can be found in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 3.3.10** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Figure 6.3**
North Sea Regional Advisory Council	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/01/2014	It is not clear from the data representation of fishing activity derived from VMS what density of VMS means. Measures to minimise or mitigate for the potential loss of access to the project areas are not sufficiently well defined. An appropriate scheme of mitigation for seine netting should be defined. NFFO want to work towards achieving coexistence. The ability of fisheries to continue within the sites during construction, operation	Y	Forewind noted that the clarity of density of VMS is required, further information on this can be found in Section 3.2.9 Forewind will consult with relative fisheries representatives to determine a co-existence plan, further information on this topic can be found in Section 9.7 Forewind noted the comments concerning continuation of fishing	**15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 3.2.9** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 9.7** **15 Commercial**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			and decommissioning should be assessed. We acknowledge that publically available data sources do not allow assessments to take into account the degree to which the individual fishing grounds of particular fishing businesses are affected. The ES should clearly acknowledge at relevant points in the document that individual fishing businesses may be affected to greater levels than are possible to be assessed due to data limitations. Ch 4, App A: Cumulative Impact Assessment: The CIA on fisheries does not currently address proposed management measures for fisheries within Dogger Bank SAC. We would expect this to represent a significant additional impact upon fishing activity in the area.		during various stages of the project, further information on this can be found in Table 3.3 and Table 3.4, which explain the criteria used for assessment of impacts Forewind noted the comments concerning data availability, requests for additional, higher resolution data have been sent to Dutch, Danish & UK fisheries representatives. Further information on this topic can be found in section 3.3.10 Forewind noted the comment concerning cumulative impacts, SAC is considered within Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries and charted within baseline figure 6.3. Management measures have yet to be agreed, and further information on this topic can be found in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries	**Fisheries, Table 3.3 and Table 3.4** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Section 3.3.10** **15 Commercial Fisheries, Figure 6.3**
16 Shipping and Navigation						
Royal Yachting Association	TS S42 Second Stage	20/11/2013	The RYA is content that the issues that it raised in its PEI3 response are adequately described in chapter 16 of the Draft Environmental Statement. In response to its concerns on site layout, the RYA notes that rules have been developed that will apply to the final	Y	Forewind noted the response from the RYA, further information on layout options and rules can be found in Section 5	**16 Shipping and Navigation, Section 5**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			proposed array layout which restrict the array patterns employed. The RYA further notes that the rules will be implemented into the final Development Consent Order. The RYA understands the need to retain some flexibility on the scheme design, but it would have expected the planned site layout to be more mature than it appears in the project description.			
Chamber of Shipping	TS S42 Second Stage	08/01/2014	The chamber is generally satisfied that the development will impact minimally upon shipping and navigation in the area due to the relatively low levels of commercial traffic present. The chamber are concerned that when the wind farms are assessed in combination with other proposed projects in the area, both within the Dogger Bank Zone and elsewhere, the potential impacts may be higher than those assessed in isolation. The chamber view the update to the SNSOWF work, and addition co-operation between developers, as vital to ensuring that the cumulative impacts on shipping and navigation are assessed in a holistic manner. The chamber remains concerned over the proposed layouts of the wind farms in the Dogger Bank Zone, both in terms of the site boundaries and potential	Y	Forewind noted the comments from Trinity House, further information on site layout options, layout rules and embedded mitigation measures can be found in Section 5. Further information on cumulative impacts can be found in Section 10. Forewind have committed to change the name of the wind farms	**16 Shipping and Navigation, Section 5** **16 Shipping and Navigation, Section 10**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			inconsistencies in turbine layouts. The chamber recommends that any export cables are buried to a minimum of one metre below the seabed as recommended by the MCA. Where burial is not possible and protection is required, navigable water depth should not be reduced by more than 5% of chart datum. The chamber shares the concerns of the MCA and THLS over the proposal to name the wind farms "Teesside". The chamber would support any action by Forewind to change the name of the wind farms.			
EPIC Regeneration Consultants LLP	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	20/12/2013	There is a high likelihood that this development will have significant cumulative impacts when taken in conjunction with those already created by the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm and the Breagh pipeline. There is concern that this development will lead to yet further displacement of anchorages for Teesport-bound shipping onto traditional fishing grounds. Should Hartlepool be selected as the construction port it would have a significant impact on the fishermen of Hartlepool, as they could anticipate having their access into and out of port hampered by the need to accommodate shipping movements for over three and a	Y	Forewind have noted the concerns over cumulative impacts, and further information on this can be found in Section 10 Forewind have noted the concerns over impacts to shipping, further information on embedded mitigation can be found in Section 5 and Appendix 16A Navigational Risk Assessment Report contains further details of additional mitigation measures.	**16 Shipping and Navigation, Section 10** **16 Shipping and Navigation, Section 5 and Appendix 16A**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			half years. It is essential that Forewind consider the cumulative impact of any development and growth plans for Teesport, particularly where these will lead to either an increase in the volume of shipping or the average tonnage of vessels using the port.			
24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality						
Tees Valley RIGS	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	29/11/2013	An email from Tees Valley RIGS showing an area of Red Howles which they would like Forewind to avoid	Y	Forewind noted the response and the area of the coastline the Tees Valley RIGS would like to be avoided. Forewind will research the Red Howles area and whether or not this will be avoided during construction. Further information on this can be found in Section 4 of Chapter 24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality	**24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality**
Tees Valley RIGS	TS s47 Non-present Second Stage	10/12/2013	Tees Valley RIGS request that it would be desirable that positive measures are taken during construction to ensure that accidental damage does not occur from heavy equipment or any other actions to the Red Howles Site	Y	Forewind have noted the response from Tees Valley RIGS and further information on the cable route can be found in Section 4 of the chapter and in Appendix 24A	**24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality**
28 Traffic and Access						
Kirkleatham Memorial Limited	TS s47 Within 1km Second Stage	07/12/2013	The crematorium owners expressed concerns at the location of access points in relation to the crematorium entrance, and the effect of more vehicles on the road and the impact it will have on services, as well as the mud that vehicles	N	Forewind noted the concerns over traffic and the access points adjacent to the crematorium. All impacts will be temporary in nature and traffic impacts have been assessed and are not	**28 Traffic and Access**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Applicant Regard	Chapter Reference
			will bring from the fields on to the roads that will get on their vehicles		considered a significant impact to the area. There will also be wheel wash facilities in place to prevent mud being taken from the agricultural fields to the road network. Further information on traffic assessments, impacts and proposed mitigation can be found in Chapter 28 Traffic and Access	
29 Noise						
Kirkleatham Memorial Limited	TS s47 Within 1km Second Stage	07/12/2013	The crematorium owners highlighted concern over noise from construction and traffic, which will disrupt services	N	Forewind noted the concerns over noise from the construction works and the impact it will have on the crematorium. Forewind have assessed the potential noise impacts and these assessments show that the noise will be below the minimum impact threshold of 65db. Further information on noise assessments can be found in Chapter 29 Noise and vibration	**29 Noise**

FOREWIND

DOGGER BANK
TEESSIDE A & B

March
2014

Consultation Report
Appendix L.3

Summary of comments contained within questionnaires received from Section 47 consultees during the second phase of statutory consultation

Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001

Application Reference 5.1.12

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
Questionnaires				
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q1	22/11/2013	Positive response. The resident highlighted a future housing development close to Forewind's project and suggested an alternate site for the converter stations at the site of a power station currently being decommissioned.	Forewind acknowledges the response and comments. Future housing developments are considered by Forewind and are constantly updated with the local council. Converter station sites have been chosen through an extensive site selection process, details of which can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives. Further information on cumulative impacts can be found in chapter 33 Cumulative Impact Assessment	Forewind's site selection process can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q2	22/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire, not raising any issues	Forewind noted the response	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q3	22/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire. There was one comment questioning why converter stations are required and whether or not this is due to the purchase of European model turbines	Forewind noted the response and comments. The model of wind turbine to be used on the Dogger Bank has not yet been finalised, but will generate in AC and be converted to DC for reduced losses when transporting to land. Converter stations on land will then convert back to AC to connect to the National Grid.	Further information on project infrastructure can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q4	22/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire, with no additional comments	Forewind noted the response	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q5	22/11/2013	A positive questionnaire response, with no additional comments. The Robinsons are members of the RSPB but happy with the proposals	Forewind noted the response	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q6	22/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire, highlighting that the offshore environmental topics are very important to the local area	Forewind noted the comments and the concern over offshore topics.	Forewind's assessments, offshore surveys and impacts can be found in Chapter 9 Marine

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
				Physical Processes, Chapter 10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality, Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q7	22/11/2013	A neutral/undecided questionnaire, highlighting concerns over marine mammals, marine physical processes, onshore construction, all offshore environmental aspects, marine and coastal archaeology. Also highlighted was the landfall location and that it could cause Marske beach to lose sand as EDF offshore wind farm is doing. Also raised concern about potential future projects on the same plot of land	Forewind noted the response and comments received, particularly concerns over offshore environmental and archaeological factors, as well as the landfall and construction impacts.	Further information on offshore topics can be found in Chapter 8 Designated Sites, Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes, Chapter 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 14 Marine Mammals and Chapter 18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology. More information on onshore construction and infrastructure can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q8	22/11/2013	A positive questionnaire response. The resident highlighted that Forewind's project would be built near a currently under construction crematorium	Forewind acknowledges the comments made and is aware of the crematorium near the cable route, which will be avoided.	Forewind has received feedback from the crematorium and is aware of the proximity of the establishment to the cables route. Further

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
				information on the site selection process can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q9	23/11/2013	A positive questionnaire with no additional comments on the draft environmental statement	Forewind noted the response	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q10	23/11/2013	A positive questionnaire, with some comments on offshore environmental and human topics, highlighting that impacts should be minimized and all species should be protected. The resident is also interested in more detail on the socio-economic benefits of the development.	Forewind noted the response and comments received concerning offshore environmental and human topics, as well as the socio-economic benefits of the development	Further information on offshore environmental topics can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals. Further information on offshore human topics can be found in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries and Chapter 18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology Further information on Socio-economics can be found in Chapter 22 Socio-economics
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q11	23/11/2013	A positive questionnaire, highlighting the potential serious impacts on fish, shellfish and marine mammals.	Forewind noted the response and comments, including the highlighted concerns over offshore environmental topics	Further information on the potential impacts to offshore environmental topics can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q12	23/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire, highlighting come concern over the effects of construction on marine physical processes and marine mammals. The resident also asked whether or not Forewind could investigate a standard industry wide method for cumulative impact assessment	Forewind noted the response and comments. The cumulative impact assessment approach used is similar to that recommended by RenewableUK	Further information on offshore environmental topics can be found in Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals Further information on Forewind's Cumulative impact assessment methodology can be found in Chapter 33 Cumulative Impact Assessment.
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q13	23/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire with no additional comments	Forewind noted the response	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q14	23/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire, highlighting some concern over designated sites, marine ecology, fish and shellfish, marine mammals, civil aviation and human safety. It was also suggested that the turbines be a colour that can be noticed by birds	Forewind noted the response and additional comments on offshore human and environmental topics. Forewind also noted the suggestion that the turbines be a colour noticeable to birds.	Further information on offshore environmental topics can be found in Chapter 8 Designated Sites, Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals. Further information on civil aviation assessments can be found in Chapter 19 Military Activity and Civil Aviation. Further information concerning the wind

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
				turbines can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q15	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire received from a member of the local community. The only concern was around Marine Mammals and the effect foundations may have on them.	Forewind noted the questionnaire response, and the concerns regarding marine mammals.	Further information concerning impacts on marine mammals (through construction and operation) can be found in Chapter 14 Marine Mammals
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q16	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire received from the public exhibitions. The only concerns raised from it are fish and shellfish, marine mammals and the location of the landfall. The landfall comments related the those living closest, and the offshore ecological comments were concerning the impact from the location of the turbines on the habitats	Forewind noted the comments received in the questionnaire. Extensive studies on offshore ecology have been made including impact assessments and proposed mitigation and a thorough site selection process was followed to identify the preferred landfall	Further information concerning impacts to fish and shellfish ecology and marine mammals can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals. Detailed information on the site selection process, including the landfall selection, can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q17	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire from the public exhibitions. The resident raised various points, including impacts on fish and shellfish, marine mammals and that there should be more turbines offshore and have a higher generation capacity	Forewind noted the comments received in the questionnaire. Multiple studies have been completed on fish and shellfish and marine mammals, including impact assessments and proposed mitigation. The final design choices for wind turbines has not yet been made, and will be made in the pre-construction phase	Further information concerning impacts to fish and shellfish ecology and marine mammals can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals. Further information on offshore infrastructure can be found in Chapter 5

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
				Project Description
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q18	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire from the exhibitions, with no additional comments or queries	Forewind noted the questionnaire and the positive answers	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q19	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire from the public exhibitions, with some additional positive comments on the landscaping designs around Lazenby	Forewind noted the questionnaire response, including the positive comments concerning landscaping	Further information on landscaping around the converter stations can be found in Chapter 21 Landscape and Visual Impacts
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q20	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire response from the public exhibitions, with no additional comments or queries	Forewind noted the positive response application	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q21	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire response from the public exhibitions, with no additional comments or queries	Forewind noted the response questionnaire	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q22	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire from the public exhibitions, with no additional comments or questions	Forewind noted the positive response questionnaire	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q23	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire received from the public exhibitions. The questionnaire has positive comments concerning Forewind's assessed impacts on birds and the proposed mitigation at the converter station site	Forewind noted and recorded the positive comments from the questionnaire	Further information birds can be found in Chapter 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology and Chapter 25 Terrestrial Ecology. More information on the converter station mitigation proposals can be found in Chapter 21 Landscape and Visual Impacts
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q24	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire response from the public exhibitions. The resident comments that there should more turbines included in the proposal and that we should make sure that the fish and shellfish and marine mammals impacts	Forewind noted the comments received in the questionnaire. Forewind have undertaken a number of offshore surveys and assessments focusing on offshore ecology, including	The results of Forewind's impact assessments on marine mammals and fish and shellfish can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
		are considered.	impact assessments to marine mammals and fish and shellfish	Shellfish and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals. Further information on the total installed capacity of the wind farms can be found in Chapter 5 Project description
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q25	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire received from public exhibitions, with no additional comments or queries	Forewind noted the positive response in the questionnaire	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q26	25/11/2013	A neutral questionnaire from the public exhibitions. There were no additional comments or queries on the questionnaire, and the resident felt neutral or undecided about most topics	Forewind noted the response from the questionnaire	No response
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q27	25/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire from the public exhibitions. The resident noted that gravity base foundations would have less of an impact on the environment and that they were positive towards the proposed location of the converter stations	Forewind noted the comments on the questionnaire and the comments concerning foundation type	Further information on potential foundations can be found in Chapter 5 project description, and further information on the converter station location can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q28	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire from the public exhibitions. The questionnaire noted concern over marine and coastal ecology, and highlighted that more information on socio-economic impacts would be good to see such as skills and jobs, investment in local area etc.	Forewind noted the positive response and comments from the questionnaire, including the residents' concerns over offshore ecology and the request for more socio-economic information	More information on marine and coastal ecology, including assessments, impacts and mitigation can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Coastal Ecology. Further information on the socio-economic impacts to the area can be found in Chapter 22 Socio-Economics

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q29	25/11/2013	A positive questionnaire received at the public exhibitions. The resident commented that they would like to see a map showing approximate distances offshore of the wind farm, that they had concerns over fish and shellfish, marine mammals and shipping and navigation. They also commented that they had been concerned about the erosion of cliffs at landfall due to the project, but were reassured by the consultation	Forewind noted the comments received in the questionnaire and the concerns over the offshore topics. A map showing the approximate location of the offshore zone is displayed within the ES, and Forewind is pleased to note that the consultation reassured the resident's concerns over landfall erosion.	Further information on the topics mentioned can be found in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish, Chapter 14 Marine Mammals and Chapter 16 Shipping and Navigation. Description on distances and maps of the Dogger Bank Zone can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q30	25/11/2013	A positive response questionnaire from the public exhibitions. The resident commented on the positive nature of substation siting and the mitigation that had been suggested had been suggested with the local residents in mind	Forewind noted the positive response from the questionnaire.	Further information on the siting of the converter stations and the proposed visual mitigation can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives and Chapter 21 Landscape and Visual Impact respectively
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q31	26/11/2013	A questionnaire received after the exhibitions. The overall response was neutral, with a large number of comments. The comments focused on number of wind turbines, the fact the concrete gives off a lot of CO2 in production, offshore ecology in general, consultation with specific bird groups, the fact that all land should be reinstated properly after cable burial and that the visual mitigation at the converter station site should become a natural habitat. The resident also raised concerns over CO2 production.	Forewind has noted the comments received from the questionnaire. The number of wind turbines in each wind farm zone is limited to a maximum of 200, and the exact levels of CO2 production are not yet known as the production methods will not be finalised until after submission. Forewind has carried out an extensive number of offshore and onshore impact assessments, with proposed mitigation where required. All land onshore will be reinstated to its former state once installation of the cable route is complete.	The number of turbines, including studies, foundations and installation methods has been assessed and further information can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description. The results and proposed mitigation from Forewind's offshore surveys in the residents areas of concern can be found in Chapters 12, 13 and 14. Further information on all offshore

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
				topics, environmental and human, can be found from Chapter 8 through to Chapter 19. Further information about the reinstatement of land can be found in Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture and further information on the mitigation at the converter stations can be found in Chapter 21 Landscape and Visual Impact
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q32	28/11/2013	A positive questionnaire response received after the public exhibitions. There was one comment, questioning if other alternative landfalls had been considered, including locations such as Coatham Beach	Forewind noted the questionnaire response. Forewind has undertaken an extensive site selection process, during which a number of alternative landfalls were considered, including a landfall to the north of the Wilton Complex. The current landfall is the preferred choice after this process.	Further details on the site selection process, in which the preferred landfall was identified, can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q33	11/12/2013	A questionnaire sent in with a consultation response. The questionnaire is negative overall, expressing concerns over the efficiency of the equipment used, the location of the windfarm, the landfall, marine and coastal ecology and seabirds	Forewind have noted the comments received in the questionnaire and the concerns over project infrastructure, site selection and ecology. Forewind have followed an extensive site selection process, both onshore and offshore, as well as numerous ecological surveys	A study of the project infrastructure can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description. More information on the site selection process, including the location of the wind farm and onshore infrastructure can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives. More information on offshore birds and ecology,

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
				including impact assessments and proposed mitigation, can be found in Chapter 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology and Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q34	19/12/2013	A questionnaire sent in on behalf of the land owner by the land agent. The only comments were that land with development potential should be avoided and the drainage consultant should be approved by the landowners	Forewind noted the comments in the questionnaire. The drainage consultant will not be appointed until post consent	A drainage consultant will not be appointed until post consent
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q35	19/12/2013	A questionnaire sent on behalf of the landowner by the land agent. The only comments were that land with development potential should be avoided and the drainage contractor should be approved by the landowners	Forewind noted the comments received in the questionnaire. The drainage contractor will not be appointed until post consent	A drainage consultant will not be appointed until post consent
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q36	19/12/2013	A completed questionnaire sent by the land agent representing the landowner. The only comment received was that land with development potential should be avoided and that the drainage contractor should be approved by landowners	Forewind noted the response in the questionnaire, and appointment of a drainage contractor does not take place until post consent	A drainage consultant will not be appointed until post consent
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q37	19/12/2013	A questionnaire sent on behalf of the landowners by the land agent. Comments on the questionnaire were that the drainage contractor should be approved by the occupier of the land, that access over the cable route will be required during construction and access past Lackenby substation is limited, and the temporary work compounds would be more secure by the A1053	Forewind noted the comments in the questionnaire. A drainage contractor will not be approved until post consent, and Forewind are looking at the option of relocating the construction compounds. Where possible, landowners and tenants will be able to access all areas of their land during construction	A drainage consultant will not be appointed until post consent. Forewind have moved temporary construction compounds to the side of the A1053 and where possible, access will be maintained for landowners
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q38	19/12/2013	A questionnaire received on behalf of the land owner from the land agent. The comments	Forewind noted the questionnaire response. A drainage contractor will	A drainage consultant will not be appointed until

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
		received were that the drainage contractor should be approved by the land occupiers, and that consultation on the access points and compounds is required	not be appointed until post consent	post consent
TS_2nd Stage S47_Q39	23/12/2013	A questionnaire received after the exhibitions from a local resident in Redcar. The overall feedback is that the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B projects are too large, with too many turbines and they do not support the project. The resident feels Forewind have not given enough consideration to the impact on bird life, and expressed concern over all offshore environmental and human topics, aside from Designated Sites and Commercial Fisheries. They also expressed concern over permanent changes to wave heights and tidal current velocities. The resident also expressed concern over the physical onshore impacts, noise, dust and traffic.	Forewind has noted the comments received in the questionnaire. A significant number of offshore and onshore bird surveys have taken place during the planning of Dogger Bank Teesside A & B. With regard to wave heights and tidal currents, the worst case scenarios have been assessed and the variations for both are within the natural variations experienced on the Dogger Bank. Forewind has also undertaken a significant number of onshore surveys concerning traffic, access points, noise, dust and other physical onshore topics, including proposed mitigation where required.	Further information on ornithology impacts and mitigation can be found in Chapter 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology and Chapter 25 Terrestrial Ecology. Further information on all offshore topics can be found from Chapter 8 Designated Sites through to Chapter 20 Seascape and Visual Character. Further information on wave heights and tidal currents can be found in Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes. Further information on noise, dust and traffic can be found in Chapter 28 Traffic and Access, Chapter 29 Noise and Vibration and Chapter 30 Air Quality.

FOREWIND

DOGGER BANK
TEESSIDE A & B

March
2014

Consultation Report
Appendix L.4

Summary of comments contained within comment cards received from Section 47 consultees during the second phase of statutory consultation

Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001

Application Reference 5.1.12

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
Comment Cards				
TS_2nd Stage S47_CC1	22/11/2013	A comment that the Heritage Coast on Forewind's work is out of date, and it now extends to Tees Bay (Tees Gare)	Forewind will investigate further to determine whether or not the Heritage Coast has been extended. Communication from the resident providing the comment card confirmed that the Heritage Coast has not been officially extended but is under consideration.	Forewind noted the comment, and the later consultation confirming that the Heritage Coast has not been officially extended. Forewind will continue to monitor discussions on the Heritage Coast
TS_2nd Stage S47_CC2	23/11/2013	A comment card from the public exhibitions that highlights a road through Sembcorp that the resident states is a bridle path and Forewind need to consider an alternative should it be closed. They also highlighted that the path may not be marked as it is within Sembcorp land	Forewind noted the comment and will investigate further in to the bridle path	Forewind will investigate into the bridle path, and should it exist, and alternative path will be established as per Chapter 23 Tourism and Recreation.
TS_2nd Stage S47_CC3	23/11/2013	A comment card received at the exhibition. The resident noted three points on the card, these being is it possible to raise the height of Sembcorp mounds, what the method of conversion will be at the converter stations, and what will happen to the footpath between the converter stations and Greystone road	Forewind noted the questions received on the comment card. Forewind has designed the bunding as mitigation for the Dogger Bank Teesside A & B converter stations, so that they will be hidden from the view of the village. It is not within Forewind's remit to design the bunding for future developer's projects. The converter stations have been assessed using a worst case scenario of equipment, further information on which can be found in and Vibration. All paths and roads will be reinstated to their original state following construction should there be any requirement to close them.	Further information on the bunding can be found in Chapter 21 Landscape and Visual Impact. Further information on the project infrastructure, including the converter stations, and converter station noise impacts and mitigation can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description and Chapter 29 Noise. Further information on the reinstatement of paths and roads can be found in Chapter 23 Tourism and Recreation.

Consultee	Date Received	Summary Text	Applicant Regard	Answer to Questions
TS_2nd Stage S47_CC4	23/11/2013	A comment card from the exhibitions that states that the proposed bunding would block an existing access track to the fields used by a local farmer, with the track being paved with stone.	Forewind noted the comment and a member of the Forewind team visited the site on 25112013 to view the track. Following on from this, Forewind has proposed a new type of bunding that would allow access to the fields around the bunding.	Forewind have investigated the bunding and proposed a new type of bunding that would allow access to the fields. This proposal is to be agreed with the local council and will be designed in the pre-construction phase
TS_2nd Stage S47_CC5	26/11/2013	A freepost comment card received after the exhibitions, stating that no one at the exhibitions could tell the resident the exact number of tonnes of CO2 generated by the production and installation of the turbines on Dogger Bank Teesside A & B. The resident also wanted to know how many permanent full time jobs would be available after installation in Redcar and the UK	Forewind noted the comments received on the card. It is not possible to determine the CO2 production of the wind farm as this is dependent on components and methodologies for installation, none of which has been finalised at this time.	More information on the socio-economic impacts of Dogger Bank Teesside A & B can be found in Chapter 22 Socio-Economics. The exact number of tonnes of CO2 cannot be determined until the project infrastructure components and methodologies have been determined