



**DOGGER BANK  
TEESSIDE A & B**

**March  
2014**

# Consultation Report Appendix I

**First Phase Section 42 Responses & Forewind Regard  
(Dogger Bank Teesside)**

**Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001**

**Application Reference 5.1.9**



**DOGGER BANK  
TEESSIDE A & B**

**March  
2014**

# Consultation Report

## Appendix I.1

List of all responses received from Section 42 consultees during the first phase of statutory consultation

**Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001**

**Application Reference 5.1.9**

Consultee	Date Received	Stage	Issues raised
North York Moors National Park	14/05/2012	S42 Phase 1	Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Terrestrial Ecology
ES Pipelines Ltd, ESP Connections Ltd, ESP Electricity Limited & ESP Networks Ltd	23/05/2012	Scoping	Consultation
Loftus Town Council	24/05/2012	S42 Phase 1	Socio-Economics, Assessment of Alternatives
Middlesbrough Borough Council	28/05/2012	Scoping	Consultation
Egdon Resources (UK) Limited	29/05/2012	S42 Phase 1	Assessment of Alternatives
Sembcorp Utilities (UK) Limited Scu (UK)	29/05/2012	S42 Phase 1	Consultation
Cable and Wireless Worldwide	30/05/2012	S42 Phase 1	Other Marine Users
Envoy Asset Management Limited, Independent Pipelines Limited, Quadrant Pipelines Limited & Independent Power Networks Limited	06/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Land Use and Agriculture
Civil Aviation Authority	08/06/2012	Scoping	Military Activity and Civil Aviation
North York Moors National Park	11/06/2012	Scoping	Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Terrestrial Ecology
Guisborough Town Council	11/06/2012	Scoping	Commercial Fisheries
CEMEX UK Marine Ltd	12/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Other Marine Users
The Coal Authority	12/06/2012	Scoping	Consultation
North Yorkshire County Council	13/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Marine and Coastal Archaeology, Terrestrial Ecology,
Health and Safety Executive	13/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Assessment of Alternatives
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC)	14/06/2012	Scoping	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
Scarborough Borough Council	15/06/2012	Scoping	Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation
Centrica Energy	15/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Other Marine Users
Trinity House	18/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Shipping and Navigation
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit	19/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Consultation
English Heritage	19/06/2012	Scoping	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Terrestrial Archaeology

Consultee	Date Received	Stage	Issues raised
English Heritage (Offshore developments)	19/06/2012	Scoping	Marine and Coastal Archaeology
Environment Agency	19/06/2012	Scoping	Marine Water and Sediment Quality, Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality
ICI Chemicals and Polymers Limited	19/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Land Use & Agriculture
Joint Nature Conservation Committee & Natural England	19/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Designated Sites, Marine Physical Processes, Marine Water and Sediment Quality, Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Marine Mammals, Seascape and Visual Character, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Tourism and Recreation, Terrestrial Ecology, Land Use and Agriculture, Air Quality
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	19/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Assessment of Alternatives
Northumbrian Water Limited	19/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Land Use and Agriculture
Wilton Centre (No. 1) Limited	20/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Consultation
English Heritage North East Office	20/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Assessment of Alternatives, Terrestrial Archaeology
GTC Pipelines Limited	21/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Land Use & Agriculture
Public Health England (formerly Health Protection Agency)	21/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Project Description
The Highways Agency	21/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Traffic and Access
Centrica Energy	22/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Other Marine Users
English Heritage (Offshore developments)	22/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Marine and Coastal Archaeology
Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	22/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Marine Physical Processes, Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish, Commercial Fisheries
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	22/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Land Use and Agriculture
Natural England	22/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Consultation
Nexen Petroleum U.K. Limited	22/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Other Marine Users
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	22/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Consultation
GTC Pipelines Limited	28/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Land Use and Agriculture (received after the final deadline for responses)



Consultee	Date Received	Stage	Issues raised
Environment Agency	29/06/2012	S42 Phase 1	Assessment of Alternatives, Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality
Natural England	29/06/2012	TS S42 PEI1	Designated Sites, Assessment of Alternatives



**DOGGER BANK  
TEESSIDE A & B**

**March  
2014**

# Consultation Report

## Appendix I.2

Detailed responses received from Section 42 consultees during the first phase of statutory consultation, and the regard that Forewind has had to responses received

**Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001**

**Application Reference 5.1.9**

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
<b>5 Project Description</b>						
Public Health England (formerly Health Protection Agency)	TS S42 PEI1	21/06/2012	<p>HPA provided the advice on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- standards of protection for exposure to non-ionising radiation, including the power frequency electric and magnetic fields - summary in annex to the letter.</li> <li>- no body of evidence conclusively linking wind farms with adverse health effects arising from emission of chemicals, However for onshore works should follow HPA guidance</li> <li>- noise and shadow flicker issues - Forewind to consult local authorities re these topics.</li> <li>-Forewind to gather the information and present clearly - this should be or the section in the ES or separate report</li> <li>- EMS - ICNIRP guidelines to be highlighted and appropriate assessment should be done</li> </ul>	Y	Forewind noted comments from Public Health England, regarding noise issues. Forewind have undertaken thorough consultation with the relevant departments within RCBC to discuss scope, methodology and mitigation measures for the assessment.	<b>29 Noise and Vibration</b>
<b>6 Assessment of Alternatives</b>						
Loftus Town Council	TS S42 PEI1	24/05/2012	<p>Loftus Town Council attended the public exhibition and filled in the questionnaire. Response is categorised as S42 response as Loftus Town Council is S42 consultee.</p> <p>Comments from Town Council are very positive, in the TC opinion Forewind considered the best options (and 3 southerly sites are the most suitable for the TC) and addressed issues as well as possible at this stage.</p> <p>Loftus Town Council expects new</p>	Y	Forewind noted comments from Loftus Town Council, and relevant alternatives have been considered for the development. These are detailed within Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			employment for construction and maintenance phases.			
Egdon Resources (UK) Limited	<b>TS S42 PEI1</b>	29/05/2012	Egdon notified Forewind that they have a well site at Kirkleatham and a pipeline within the onshore cable area. Provided maps and contact details	Y	Forewind noted the response and confirmed that they would investigate if a crossing would be required and get in touch should this be the case. Further details of onshore site selection can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives</b>
Health and Safety Executive	<b>TS S42 PEI1</b>	13/06/2012	HSE Explosives Inspectorate would like the opportunity to comment further when more accurate cable route details are available  Contact Northern Gas Networks and SABIC UK during consultation as the areas for buried cabling is crossed by three natural gas pipelines	Y	Forewind have noted the Health and Safety Executive comments, and the site selection regarding buried cables are considered within Stage 6 (Section 4.7 of Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives)	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives, Section 4.7</b>
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	<b>TS S42 PEI1</b>	19/06/2012	National Grid ask that the location of our transmission infrastructure and any potential impact of the proposed project on our infrastructure are taken into account in the Environmental Assessment and as part of any subsequent Development Consent Order application, including the Environmental Statement.	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from NGET, and transmission infrastructure is considered within Stage 2 of the site selection process as detailed within Section 4.3 of Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives, Section 4.3</b>
English Heritage North East Office	<b>TS S42 PEI1</b>	20/06/2012	English Heritage North East responded to the PI scoping exercise and forwarded their answer to Forewind.  EH North East confirmed that Forewind has been following best practice for	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from English Heritage and comments concerning listed buildings and conservation areas are considered within Chapter 27 Terrestrial Archaeology. Further	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 27 Terrestrial Archaeology</b>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>offshore geotechnical and geophysical aspects. Confirmed that EH identified no obvious or absolute show-stoppers at this stage.</p> <p>- If site No.2 pursued, this would land the cabling within a Green Wedge in the adopted Core Strategy for Redcar &amp; Cleveland. It would, however, avoid known assets within the Marske Conservation Area and some Grade II listed buildings outwith that being the closest. Further archaeology assessment to be done.</p> <p>- Site Nos. 1,2 and 3 - less likely to be so sensitive overall.</p> <p>- Site No. 4 close to Conservation Area, and several important Grade I and II* listed buildings and structures.</p> <p>- Site Nos. 5 and 6 - lie near to Wilton Conservation Area and a Grade I listed church, some on greenfield sites. Archaeological evaluation would be needed.</p> <p>-For cable corridors it is important that the archaeological potential of any proposed route is investigated.</p> <p>-The Conservation Plan for Kirkleatham should be referenced in preparing the EIA.</p>		information on the site selection process that Forewind has undertaken can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	
Environment Agency	<b>TS S42 PEI1</b>	29/06/2012	Additional comments to the Scoping Opinion:	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from the Environment Agency, and site selection is	<b>05 Project Description 06 Assessment of</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>EA would welcome the opportunity to meet with Forewind and discuss.</p> <p>Comments on PEI1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-a sequential approach and rationale to be presented - flood risk</li> <li>- laying cables within flood zones is not a concern to EA, but reinstatement of ground levels to the pre-construction level would be expected.</li> <li>- appropriate measures for crossing watercourses required.</li> <li>- surface water drainage from these sites to be considered.</li> <li>- there are many sea defences along this coastal stretch - HDD method should be used. New defences will be built- Forewind should contact EA as soon as will have the preferred landfall location.</li> <li>- coastal erosion to be taken into account.</li> <li>- prior written consent of the EA is required for: any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 5 metres of the top of the bank of the main river; structures either affecting or within 5 metres of the tidal or fluvial flood defence; any culver ting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse.</li> </ul>		<p>considered within Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives. Further information on crossing watercourses can be found in Chapter 24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality and Chapter 5 Project Description. Effects at the landfall, including sediment transport, can be found in Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p>	<p><b>Alternatives 09 Marine Physical Processes 24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality</b></p>
Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	29/06/2012	<p>Joint Natural England &amp; JNCC scoping opinion has been submitted to Planning Inspectorate already. In addition to those comments, the following to be recorded as a s42 consultation response for Natural England:</p>	Y	<p>Forewind have noted Natural England's comments, and the site selection process is considered within Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives. Designated sites are also included within individual topic assessments where</p>	<p><b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 08 Designated Sites</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>1. Appendix C Site Selection Report Figure 3.4 should identify the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA</p> <p>2. Appendix C Site Selection Report, illustrates in number of figures, the Local Site's Redcar to Saltburn Foreshore and Redcar to Saltburn Coast. We believe that these extend up to the Redcar Rocks SSSI and are incorrectly illustrated as stopping short.</p> <p>3. Natural England welcome the proposed avoidance of Landfall Area 1 which encompasses UK and European Designated sites.</p>		appropriate.	
<b>7 Consultation</b>						
ES Pipelines Ltd, ESP Connections Ltd, ESP Electricity Limited & ESP Networks Ltd	TS Scoping	23/05/2012	Response on behalf of E S Pipelines Ltd, ESP Networks Ltd, ESP Pipelines Ltd, ESP Electricity Ltd, ESP Connections Ltd. Those businesses do not have any comments to make.	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from ES Pipelines, information on utilities are included within Section 4.2 of Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture	<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture, Section 4.2</b>
Middlesbrough Borough Council	TS Scoping	28/05/2012	Council have no comments on the proposal.	N	Forewind noted the response	<b>N/A</b>
Sembcorp Utilities (UK) Limited Scu (UK)	TS S42 PE11	29/05/2012	<p>Forewind provided feedback to Sembcorp on the Lazenby public exhibition ahead of Sembcorp's meeting with the Lazenby Environmental Group.</p> <p>Sembcorp provided copies of the letter between ICI and the Lazenby</p>	Y	Forewind noted the letters provided by Sembcorp and further information on project infrastructure can be found in Chapter 5 Project description	<b>05 Project description</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			Environmental Group regarding a commitment to only use the land south of the power station for development with a low visual and environmental impact (dated 1990), and the MOM for a council meeting regarding the Instrument of Consent (dated 1991).			
The Coal Authority	TS Scoping	12/06/2012	The Coal Authority confirmed the site does not fall within the defined coalfield. The Coal Authority had no issues that it would wish to see addressed as part of the Environmental Statement for this proposal.	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from The Coal Authority, information on utilities are included within Section 4.2 of Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture	<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture, Section 4.2</b>
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	Confirmed that they had no comments to make on the proposal	N	Forewind noted the response	<b>N/A</b>
Wilton Centre (No 1) Limited	TS S42 PEI1	20/06/2012	<p>The Wilton Centre referred to the Forewind's letter dated 15 June 2012 - reminder of the consultation deadline and stated that this is the first they and their client have heard about the consultation. Their client would like to review the consultation information and it is not possible to do in the timeframes referred to in Forewind's letter. They requested the copies of the correspondence the client should have received. They do not consider that the client has been consulted with properly.</p> <p>Forewind contacted the Wilton Centre directly who confirmed that they do not have any concerns about the consultation documents. This was a mis-</p>	N	Forewind noted the response	<b>N/A</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			communication with their legal team.			
Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	Natural England informed Forewind that their lead adviser was out of office due to illness and not in a position to respond by Forewind's due date. Forewind agreed that it was possible to be flexible but that comments should be returned by the deadline date if possible	N	Forewind noted the response	N/A
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	Confirmed that they had no comments to make on the proposal	N	Forewind noted the response	N/A
<b>8 Designated Sites</b>						
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	<p>It was unclear throughout the chapter how such assessments had been made and how specific species of conservation interest (i.e. BAP species) had been accounted for.</p> <p>It is not clear how Forewind have assessed designated sites in this chapter. Whilst we accept that the assessment of cSACs and SPAs has been covered in the Appropriate Assessment information it is not clear how other designated sites have been assessed. JNCC and Natural England would like more information from Forewind on this issue so that we can have confidence in the impact statements provided.</p>	Y	<p>A reference has been made to relevant sections within other chapters where the specific assessment has been undertaken and concluded in relation to the designated sites/species throughout the assessment sections in this chapter.</p> <p>This chapter is a signposting chapter, and presents the results of the specific assessment on designated sites and species from the other chapters within the draft ES (as noted in paragraph 1.1.3). Consequently, the methodology in this chapter describes the nature of the designated sites and species and the impacts on them (assessed in the other chapters of</p>	<b>08 Designated Sites, Sections 1, 2 and 3</b>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
					the draft ES). Additional text specifically clarifying this is presented in Sections 1, 2, and 3.	
Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	29/06/2012	<p>Joint Natural England &amp; JNCC scoping opinion has been submitted to Planning Inspectorate already. In addition to those comments, the following to be recorded as a s42 consultation response for Natural England:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Appendix C Site Selection Report Figure 3.4 should identify the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA</li> <li>2. Appendix C Site Selection Report, illustrates in number of figures, the Local Site's Redcar to Saltburn Foreshore and Redcar to Saltburn Coast. We believe that these extend up to the Redcar Rocks SSSI and are incorrectly illustrated as stopping short.</li> <li>3. Natural England welcome the proposed avoidance of Landfall Area 1 which encompasses UK and European Designated sites.</li> </ol>	Y	Forewind have noted Natural England's comments, and the site selection process is considered within Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives. Designated sites are also included within individual topic assessments where appropriate and with Chapter 8 Designated Sites.	<p><b>06 Assessment of Alternatives</b></p> <p><b>08 Designated Sites</b></p>
<b>9 Marine Physical Processes</b>						
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	Scoping Report, 6.2.2, Effects on geology, proposes to scope out the effect on underlying offshore geology. As highlighted in section 28.3.3 of the Scoping Report any topics to be scoped out must be properly justified. This should include specification of what is being	Y	Forewind have noted the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England's comments concerning underlying offshore geologies and scoping them out. Further information on this and the assessment of effects during	<p><b>05 Project Description</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 7 (operational</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>considered the “underlying geology” and explanation of why and how this won't be affected, including depth below shallower geology and sediments. Should any effects upon geology be identified further information on the secondary effect upon other marine processes or ecology should be outlined.</p> <p>Scoping Report, 6.2.3, Effects on hydrodynamic processes, proposes to scope out the effect of construction infrastructure upon the hydrodynamic regime. As highlighted in Section 28.3.3 of the Scoping Report any topics to be scoped out must be properly addressed and justified and this should include detail of the construction infrastructure including dimensions, location, length of time that it will be left in place and movements, as well as any associated infrastructure such as moorings. Interaction between the infrastructure and hydrodynamic regime should be provided with an explanation of why the regime isn't affected.</p> <p>Scoping Report, 6.2.6, Effects on hydrodynamic processes and 6.2.7 Effects on sediment transport processes propose to assess the operational effects on the hydrodynamic and sediment transport processes. We are encouraged that the EIA will consider both near-field and far-field effects on hydrodynamic</p>		<p>operation can be found in Section 7 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Further information concerning the effects during construction can be found in Section 6 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>An assessment of effects during the operation of the wind farm, including sediment transport and effects from foundation structures, can be found in Section 7 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Consideration of potential effects upon the coastline can be found in Section 6.4 and 6.5 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>An assessment of effects during decommissioning, including removal of foundations, cables and landfall infrastructure, can be found in Section 8 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>An assessment of effects during construction, including increase in suspended sediments can be found in Section 6 of Chapter 9</p>	<p>effects)</p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 6 (construction effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 7 (operational effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Sections 6.4 and 6.5 (expert geomorphological assessment of landfall effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 8 (decommissioning effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 6 (construction</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>conditions. This assessment should be informed by appropriate hydrodynamic information for the development area and modelling studies. In-combination effects need also be considered, especially given the large number of turbines proposed and the overlap of the project with the Annex I sandbank habitat of the Dogger Bank cSAC. JNCC also advise that screening for an Appropriate Assessment in relation to potential effects on hydrodynamic and sedimentary processes will be required.</p> <p>The assessment on hydrodynamic processes should also consider the potential effects of the development proposal upon the coastline, coastal processes and designated sites by impediment to sediment transport; and the interaction of turbines and their effect upon hydrodynamic and sediment processes as a group, as well as individually.</p> <p>Scoping Report, 6.2.9 states that decommissioning and construction impacts will be similar and therefore proposes to scope out geology and hydrodynamic processes out of the EIA. The decommissioning effects must be addressed, particularly as this will include the removal of structures with a resultant change to the marine environment,</p>		<p>Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>The cumulative effects and impact assessment strategy can be found in Section 10 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Forewind have noted the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England's comments concerning the assessment of the export cable and landfall effects, and further information on these assessments can be found in Section 6 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Forewind has considered the construction and operation impacts, further information on which can be found in Section 6 and Section 7 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Impacts during decommissioning, including removal of foundations and cables, can be found in Section 8 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Impacts from decommissioning and the assessment of these effects can be found in Section 8 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical</p>	<p>effects)</p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 10 (cumulative effects)</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>hydrodynamic and sediment processes and potentially the remobilisation of sediments which have built up around infrastructure.</p> <p>As stated earlier in this letter, the effect of Spoils (Scoping Report, 2.3.13) should be addressed in the EIA for the effect upon benthic habitats and communities; turbidity and general water quality; and the potential for increasing or inhibiting sediment transport. Particular thought should be given to the impact of arisings from drilling into chalk as these have been seen to persist in the marine environment at other sites.</p> <p>Scoping Report, 6.5.1 states that there is an aggregate extraction licence area located on the south western edge of Tranche A. The aggregate area referred to is still in the application process (i.e. not licensed), but as Forewind pointed out that does not mean that extraction activities will not occur at this site in the future. Potential future extraction activities within Tranche A should be assessed within the cumulative impact assessment.</p>		Processes	
Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	It is noted from the project description that scour protection may be needed and could consist of protective aprons, mattresses, frond devices and rock and gravel dumping. This description also	Y	Forewind have noted the Marine Management Organisation's comments and concerns, and the effects of scour protection have been considered in Section 6.3	<b>09 Marine Physical Processes Sections 6.3 and 6.4 (expert geomorphological assessment of</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>indicates that a detailed cable burial and protection assessment will be carried out to identify the target burial depth in each area and that specifications regarding landfall cable burial will take future coastal erosion into account.</p> <p>The approach to adopt a precautionary approach to impact assessment where uncertainty exists (Section 3.3.17, page 39) has been noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that mitigation and monitoring measures are outside the remit of this document (Section 3.8.2 and 3.8.3, page 44).</p> <p>We consider that the existing environment is accurately described in section 6.1 (pages 69 to 73) with regard to geology, hydrodynamics, meteorology and geomorphology.</p> <p>No impacts to the underlying geology of the development area are predicted and this issue may be scoped out of the EIA (as suggested in 6.2.2, page 73) provided foundation penetration is restricted to the surface sediment layers.</p> <p>The potential impacts during construction are listed as temporary influences on hydrodynamics, disturbance to the seabed and an increase in suspended sediment (Sections 6.2.3 and 6.2.4, page 73). The temporary, localised impacts of</p>		<p>and Section 6.4 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Further information on Forewind's worst case scenarios can be found in Section 5 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Potential impacts as a result of construction have been assessed, and further information on this can be found in Section 6 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Further information on operational effects and hydrodynamic processes can be found in Section 7 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Further information on operational effects and sediment transport can be found in Section 7 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Impacts during decommissioning, including removal of foundations and cables, can be found in Section 8 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Further information on cumulative</p>	<p>landfall effects)</p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 5 (worst case scenarios)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 6 (construction effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 7 (operational effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 7 (operational effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical Processes Section 8 (decommissioning effects)</b></p> <p><b>09 Marine Physical</b></p>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>construction infrastructure can be scoped out of the EIA as suggested. - Section 6 Construction Effects</p> <p>Operational impacts on hydrodynamic processes are suitably described (Section 6.2.6, page 75) as localised scour and (potentially) far-field effects on the wave and tidal regime. We concur that these far-field effects need to be tested thoroughly through a modelling study. Such testing is important because of its implications for the future cumulative impacts of the wider proposed Dogger Bank zone.</p> <p>Operational effects on sediment transport processes are predicted to be restricted to scour (Section 6.2.7, page 75). Although the report is correct to state that tidal will therefore be of key importance in assessing impacts to the sediment transport regime.</p> <p>We concur that decommissioning impacts are to be similar to construction impacts (Section 6.2.9, page 75).</p> <p>We approve of the focus on the cumulative effects of this and other activities on physical processes (during operation) and sediment transport (during all project phases) (Section 6.5.1, page 75).</p>		<p>effects from other offshore projects can be found in Section 10 of Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes</p> <p>Further information on water and sediment quality can be found in Chapter 10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality</p> <p>Further information on the indirect impacts as a result of disturbance and re-suspension can be found in Chapter 10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality</p>	<p><b>Processes Section 10 (cumulative effects)</b></p> <p><b>Chapter 10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality</b></p> <p><b>Chapter 10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>Potential construction impacts on water and sediment quality are expected to be restricted to the accidental release of chemicals and discrete short-term seabed disturbance leading to the re-suspension of sediments that may contain contaminants (Section 7.2.2 and 7.2.3, page 80).</p> <p>During operation, potential impacts are expected to be indirect and the result of the disturbance and re-suspension of contaminated sediments. These impacts are expected to be localised and associated with scour around foundation structures (section 7.2.6, page 80).</p> <p>Section 28.3.2 (page 232) includes a list of aspects that are proposed to be scoped out of the EIA. Of relevance to coastal processes are the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on offshore geology</li> <li>• Impacts of the presence of construction plant on offshore geology and hydrodynamic regime.</li> <li>• Impacts of the decommissioning process on offshore geology and hydrodynamic regime.</li> </ul> <p>Scoping out these aspects is appropriate provided the foundation structures used do not penetrate the overlying sediment layer and intrude into the underlying geological formations, in which case the</p>			

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			first aspect should be included in the ES.			
<b>10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality</b>						
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	<p>Advises that the interrelations with ecology and the sandbank habitat of the Dogger Bank cSAC are assessed within this section.</p> <p>The effect of spoils should be addressed in the EIA for the effect upon benthic habitats and communities; turbidity and general water quality; and the potential for increasing or inhibiting sediment transport. Particular thought should be given to the impact of arisings from drilling into chalk as these have been seen to persist in the marine environment at other sites.</p>	Y	Forewind have noted the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England's comments on interrelations and spoil effects, and these have been addressed in Chapter 10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality, Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology and Chapter 31 Interrelationships	<p><b>10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality Section 9</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology Sections 6.7, 7.8, 8.4 and 9</b></p> <p><b>31 Interrelationships Section 5.4</b></p> <p><b>10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality Section 5</b></p>
Environment Agency	TS Scoping	19/06/2012	<p>In addition to the surveys listed in Table 7.1 (of the scoping report), the cable route within the intertidal zone should be tested for heavy metal contamination. - Section 3</p> <p>The EIA should assess the available options for spoil disposal and the impact on these options upon water quality and marine ecology. - Section 5</p> <p>The EIA should consider the potential impact of the development upon bathing</p>	Y	Forewind have noted the Environment Agency's comments on contamination, impacts on ecology and impacts on bathing waters. These have been addressed in 10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality, in Section 3 and Section 5	<p><b>10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality Section 3</b></p> <p><b>10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality Section 5</b></p> <p><b>10 Marine Water and Sediment Quality Section 5</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			water quality, particularly in relation to the works associated with the construction of the Export Cable Corridor and the landfall works within the designated bathing waters. - Section 5			
<b>11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology</b>						
North York Moors National Park	TS S42 PEI1	14/05/2012	North York Moors National Park provided some comments on ornithology impact assessment (migratory waders, merlin, other seabirds that breed on the NYM coast) before the start of the consultation period.	N	Forewind requested that North York Moors National Park respond to the formal scoping consultation to ensure their comments are considered by the NID. Planning Inspectorate confirmed on 25/6/2012 that they had received NYMNP's response to Scoping.	N/A
North York Moors National Park	TS Scoping	11/06/2012	The EIA should address the issue of whether the wind farm is likely to affect the feeding patterns of seabirds which nest along the coastal cliffs and makeup part of the diverse ecology of the National Park natural environment.	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the North York Moors National Park. Impacts to coastal breeding birds will be avoided through the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), in addition to a suite of mitigation measures to minimise disturbance to seabirds during construction outlined in Section 6.4 of Chapter 25.	<b>05 Project Description. 25 Terrestrial Ecology, Section 6.4</b>
North Yorkshire County Council	TS S42 PEI1	13/06/2012	Cumulative impacts require consideration for onshore and offshore and thorough assessment of both the onshore and offshore ecological impacts (in particular the impacts upon marine ecology, including nationally important sea bird	Y	Forewind noted the comments from North Yorkshire County Council and cumulative impacts have been considered within the chapter in Section 10. Offshore cumulative impacts in relation to	<b>11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Section 10</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			populations).		ornithology are covered in Chapter 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology. CIA will be carried out for all elements of the ES.	
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PE11	19/06/2012	<p>Existing environment Offshore waters – Whilst Tranche A is well outside the foraging range of many species of relevance to coastal SPA populations during the breeding season, it may be an area of importance to these populations pre and post breeding (and not limited to the migration period as suggested).</p> <p>Existing environment The Crown Estate &amp; Forewind Studies – The data from both studies suggest that auk species (guillemot and razorbill) are of key significance to this site. This emphasises the need to ensure that the current and future survey methodologies are able to calculate robust population estimates for these two species. Table 6.2: We would like clarification if ‘peak count’ and ‘monthly total’ are the same? Are these raw counts? Table 6.3: We would like clarification how the ‘relative abundance calculated’ was calculated?</p> <p>Potential Impacts Disturbance and Displacement – Please note that birds may also respond to the visual cues of WTGs (as well as noise). In terms of disturbance/ displacement of prey species, we encourage a collaborative</p>	Y	<p>The importance of the area to the features of designated sites has been considered for all periods of the year (presented in Sections 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11).</p> <p>Details of the methodology used to calculate population estimates have been developed over the course of the work, in consultation with stakeholders. A meeting to discuss the combined boat and aerial survey methodology was held between Forewind Ltd, the surveyors, Gardline Ltd and Hi-Def Surveying Ltd and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) in April 2010. As a result of this, a review of the methodology was instigated, led by the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO). A follow-up meeting was held in November 2010 with stakeholder representation from JNCC and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB). Key topics discussed during this meeting included; i. A review of survey data collection protocols; ii. A review of the survey</p>	<p><b>11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Sections 3, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11</b></p> <p><b>Marine and Coastal Ornithology Appendix 11A</b></p> <p><b>11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology, Sections 7, 10 and 11</b></p>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>approach to this assessment, in conjunction with the work on Fish and Shellfish impacts</p> <p>Potential Impacts Barrier effects – The barrier effect does not necessarily entail the wind farm being a ‘physical obstacle’ as such, instead the bird perceives the wind farm area as something to avoid. This avoidance behaviour leads to changes in flight paths, and hence potentially increased energetic requirements. It is questionable if the perception of the wind farm as a barrier would be worsened in high winds or reduced visibility. In fact flocks of waterfowl in the Kalmar Sound, Sweden (Pettersson, 2005) flew nearer to the wind farm before exhibiting avoidance behaviour in poor visibility and night time conditions, than in clear conditions, which may have resulted in less deviation from their intended flight path. However, the energetic consequences of this difference are undetermined. It is acknowledged that weather may have an influence on migration altitude, and that altitude varies considerably both within and between species. For many migrant species there is no existing data on migration altitude, particularly over the sea and as such, we require further evidence to support this assumption.</p>		<p>approach and whether this was sufficient to provide a robust characterisation of the populations of seabirds present in the Zone and tranche areas within this; iii. Identification of the key species for assessment and the likely effects for these species; and iv. A review of potential methodologies for assessing effects on migratory species. The report on this review, which details stakeholder discussion, was completed in April 2011 (Austin et al., 2011) and has been provided as supporting evidence in Appendix 11A.</p> <p>The effects on fish and shellfish has been considered in the assessment, especially in relation to the potential for habitat loss / changes (presented in Sections 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11).</p> <p>The assessment of barrier effects has drawn on the methodology of Maclean et al (2009) which defines sensitivity based on the tolerance of the species to the increased energetic costs associated with barrier effects (assessment presented in Sections 7, 10, and 11). It is</p>	

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>Potential Impacts Collision risk – Whilst body size and wing loading may be factors that contribute to estimating the sensitivity of a species to collision with turbines, other factors may also be relevant (e.g. predator vigilance, foraging technique). Furthermore, the risk of collision is a function of exposure and sensitivity; hence species may be sensitive to collision, but not exposed to this risk due to avoidance of the wind farm site.</p> <p>EIA process – JNCC would like to highlight that the initial survey protocol was presented to us, but it is not clear that our recommendations have been taken on board. We are encouraged that Forewind are in consultation with us (and others) regarding the survey methodologies. We acknowledge that the location of the site offers challenging conditions, and are keen to work with Forewind to ensure the surveys are fit for purpose and the data gathered is informative. It is important to recognise that the process is an iterative one, whereas data is gathered adjustments/ amendments to methodologies may be beneficial. It is also important to note that boat and aerial surveys may not be sufficient to provide information on certain ornithological issues, such as migratory/ passage species and connectivity between</p>		<p>acknowledged that there is no existing data on migration altitude for many migrant species, and thus the precautionary approach outlined in Wright et al (2012) on this issue has been followed.</p> <p>The risk of birds to collision has been assessed through the consideration of avoidance rates. Results for a range of avoidance rate have been presented, with a worst case scenario of 98% avoidance taken through to the impact assessment (assessment presented in Sections 7, 10, and 11). One exception is northern gannet, where 99% avoidance rate has been assumed (see Section 3 for reasoning). The species-specific sensitivity of receptors to collision primarily reflects the tolerance of the species' populations to the mortality associated with collisions and has been considered through two approaches.</p> <p>Details of the methodology used to calculate population estimates have been developed over the course of the work, in consultation with stakeholders (see above).</p>	

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			protected sites and Tranche A. Complimentary survey methods may be necessary to inform these issues (such as tracking, radar etc.), and we would welcome early engagement with JNCC and other relevant stakeholders to work towards a suitable approach.		Consideration of the potential connectivity between the development area and protected sites has drawn on recent information on the potential foraging ranges of species and specific tracking studies (see Section 3 for details).	
<b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology</b>						
North Yorkshire County Council	TS S42 PEI1	13/06/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NYCC welcome the proposed production of a shadow HRA and satisfy the in-combination tests of the Habitats Directive (including impact on Natura 2000 sites). NYCC suggested checking the HRA from Minerals and Waste Development Framework once ready.</li> <li>- Forewind to consider CI for onshore and offshore and thorough assessment of both the onshore and offshore ecological impacts (in particular the impacts upon marine ecology, including nationally important sea bird populations).</li> </ul>	Y	Forewind noted the comments from North Yorkshire County Council and cumulative impacts have been considered within the chapter in Section 10. CIA will be carried out for all elements of the ES.	<b>Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology Sections 10</b>
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	<p>Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats should be identified within the ES - Section 4.4</p> <p>“Temporary Loss of Intertidal Habitats”, may occur within designated sites, or have the potential to affect designated sites or their interest features, therefore the loss should be assessed considering area of loss, recovery period and effects</p>	Y	Forewind noted the comments submitted by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England covering a number of topics relating to marine and intertidal ecology. These comments have been addressed in multiple sections within Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology	<p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 4.4</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 6.2</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology,</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>upon the intertidal and the ecology and interest features it supports. The ES would also benefit if collected survey data was presented and discussed in relation to far-field regional data to set the site specific data into context.</p> <p>“Loss of Subtidal Habitats”, Scoping Report states that the installation of turbine foundations, scour protection and ancillary structures will cause direct physical disturbance. We highlight that the installation of these structures will also lead to direct loss of sediment habitat. Any loss should be assessed considering area of loss, and effects upon the subtidal habitat and the ecology and interest features it supports.</p> <p>Scoping Report stated that maintenance activities will have a short-term localised impact upon intertidal habitats. Detail on the realistic requirements for maintenance operations should be provided in the ES along with an assessment of their potential impacts considering area of loss, recovery period, frequency of disturbance and effects upon the intertidal, and subtidal, and the ecology and interest features it supports. Experience from other developments has shown that whilst cabling activities were considered as a one off activity and maintenance impacts considered temporary, they have rarely</p>		<p>An assessment of physical disturbance to habitats and species and temporary habitat loss can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 6.2</p> <p>Further information on loss of habitat via placement of project infrastructure (such as foundations and scour protection) can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.1</p> <p>Assessment of temporary impacts due to physical disturbance caused by maintenance activities can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.2</p> <p>Assessment of impacts on subtidal ecology as a result of suspended sediment concentration, change in hydrodynamics and increase in sediment deposition can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.3 - 7.5</p> <p>Assessment of temporary impacts due to physical disturbance</p>	<p><b>Section 7.1</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.3 – 7.5</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.2</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.7</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.6</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 8.3</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 8.2</b></p> <p><b>12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 10</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>been this in reality with many developments needing to undertake further remedial works to replace, repair, rebury or add additional scour protection at a point in the future, when the best environmental options are limited.</p> <p>Impacts on subtidal ecology as a result of changes in physical processes, identifies the effects of foundation structures, but should be extended to include all other infrastructure (e.g. collector substations, converter stations, platforms, moorings etc.) and scour protection on the foundations and cables. The impacts of maintenance should also be included.</p> <p>Detailed consideration should be given to operational and maintenance effects, identifying all works required and their frequency. The assessment should identify and assess the impacts of all maintenance activities, such as the addition or removal of scour protection; increased noise from maintenance works etc., and should not restrict this to pollution incidents - Section 7.2</p> <p>Impact on subtidal ecology as a result of electromagnetic fields, identifies a lack of evidence regarding the effects of electromagnetic fields upon the benthic community and therefore proposes to scope this topic out of the Environmental</p>		<p>caused by maintenance activities can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.2</p> <p>The assessment of the impacts from electromagnetic fields on benthic communities can be found in Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology, Section 7.7</p> <p>Forewind noted the comments submitted by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England covering a number of topics relating to marine and intertidal ecology. These comments have been addressed in multiple sections within Chapter 12 Marine and Intertidal Ecology</p>	



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>Impact Assessment (EIA). Due to this lack of knowledge about impacts, this topic should be scoped into the EIA. High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) is a new technology and the topic will require further assessment or monitoring and the approach consulted upon in more detail in the early stages of the EIA. - Section 7.7</p> <p>The assessment should identify changes in the natural substrate by introduced structures, foundations and scour protection. This should include potential positive and negative impacts through increasing biodiversity; introduction of species and creation of habitat for species that would not naturally occur in that region; and facilitation of the spread of non-native species. The wider effects of this upon the ecological functioning of the surrounding sedimentary habitats should also be addressed - Section 7.6</p> <p>Disturbance to intertidal habitats (Decommissioning) identifies the intention to leave cables in situ in the intertidal. This proposal should be considered in detail within the ES and encompass on-going coastal changes, coastal retreat and beach/seabed lowering. The potential for exposure of the cables and effects upon coastal processes as well as the requirement for later protection or removal of the cables should be included.</p>			

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>The ES must consider the potential need for a monitoring plan for exposure, or effects upon the coastal processes caused by cables, over the lifetime of the project and if left permanently in situ. - Section 8.3</p> <p>Decommissioning impacts upon subtidal ecology should also consider the potential impacts upon habitat and species that have developed and been supported by these structures. - Section 8.2</p> <p>Cumulative Impacts should also consider the cumulative effects within the project that is the potential for a number of various activities or structures from the project to combine to have an adverse impact, rather than assessing each activity or structure independently. - Section 10</p>			
Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	Request to be consulted on the more detailed proposed survey designs, sample collection protocols and sample processing protocols prior to the surveys being mobilised.	N	Forewind noted the request from the Marine Management Organisation	N/A
<b>13 Fish and Shellfish</b>						
MMO	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	Whilst a desktop study has identified most of the main commercial fish species utilising the area. In the Dogger Bank Project One scoping report, (p63), the MMO highlighted that further investigation	Y	The potential for EMF derived from the export cable and array cables have been addressed in the Section 7 of this Chapter including potential impacts on	<b>13 Fish and Shellfish, Sections 6, 7 and 8</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>of Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) through the EIA in context of High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) cables. However, there is no mention of elasmobranchs or consideration of EMF in the offshore PEI1. It is recommended that this is addressed and any impacts considered and mitigation measures proposed i.e. cable depth, EMF emissions etc.</p> <p>Forewind to consider short-snouted seahorses.</p>		<p>elasmobranch species.</p> <p>Forewind has noted the MMO's comments regarding short-snouted seahorses and confirms that all fish species around the project site have been considered in Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>	
Environment Agency	TS S42 PEI1	29/06/2012	Consideration must be given in the EIA to migratory fish such as salmon and sea trout that transit through the study area	Y	Forewind has noted the Environment Agency's Comments concerning migratory fish and these have been assessed within Chapter 13 Fish and Shellfish	<b>13 Fish and Shellfish</b>
<b>14 Marine Mammals</b>						
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	<p>Detailed timelines and potential construction scenarios should be provided in the ES, particularly with regard to more disturbing construction activities such as piling, to allow for sufficient assessment particularly with regard to sensitive species of bird and marine mammals.</p> <p>The ES should set out the approach to noise assessment, including thresholds; units and presentation of data; and the full range of physical impacts including Temporary Threshold Shift and Permanent Threshold Shift, and the zone</p>	Y	Forewind has noted the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England's comments concerning construction scenarios, noise assessments, EMF, decommissioning and secondary effects. Further information concerning construction scenarios and factors can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description and Chapter 14 Marine Mammals. Further information on noise assessment results and analysis can be found	<p><b>05 Project Description</b></p> <p><b>14 Marine Mammals, Section 3.3</b></p> <p><b>14 Marine Mammals, Section 7.5</b></p> <p><b>14 Marine Mammals, Section 8</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>and duration of marine mammal avoidance / displacement.</p> <p>EMF is not normally assessed against pinnipeds, however due to the lack of knowledge of effects and impacts of High Voltage Direct Current, pinnipeds should be scoped in to the EIA.</p> <p>Impacts during decommissioning should be considered separately to construction, especially in relation to cumulative impacts.</p> <p>The secondary effects upon marine mammals prey resources during operation should be addressed by the EIA</p>		in Chapter 14 Marine Mammals. EMF and decommissioning assessments can be found in Chapter 14 Marine Mammals and Chapter 5 Project description.	<b>14 Marine Mammals, Section 7.6</b>
<b>15 Commercial Fisheries</b>						
Guisborough Town Council	TS Scoping	11/06/2012	Concerns to fish stock depletion as a result of construction work on Dogger Bank. States that before any construction takes place the current environmental status should be established including all life stages of all flora and fauna.	Y	Forewind has taken note of Guisborough Town Councils comments concerning fish stock depletion, and an assessment of impacts can be found in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries	<b>15 Commercial Fisheries, Sections 7, 8 and 9</b>
Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	TS S42 PE11	22/06/2012	<p>Fisheries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cannot comment on surveys (table 10.2) without further details</li> <li>- fisheries monitoring plan has not been discussed (S3.8.3)</li> <li>- will be informed by the EIA process and must be carried out during construction and operational phase</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Forewind has noted the Marine Management Organisations comments regarding fisheries monitoring. Fisheries monitoring is covered in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries.</p> <p>The Dogger Bank Teesside A &amp;</p>	<b>13 Fish and Shellfish 15 Commercial Fisheries</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			Commercial finfish fishing in the area appears to have been adequately covered, but there is no mention of shellfisheries. The corridor cuts across Bridlington Bay and this area is important for crab and lobster fisheries. A full impact assessment addressing these issues should be carried out in consultation with the local fishing industry.		B Export Cable Corridor does not pass through Bridlington Bay although it does transect grounds which record significant shellfish landings. Therefore, (in addition to finfish) a review of shellfisheries has is included within this report. Potential impacts associated with the construction, operational and decommissioning phase of Dogger Bank Teesside A & B have been assessed for both, finfish and shellfish species within Sections 6-8 in this Chapter). The potential impacts of Dogger Bank Teesside A & B on commercial fishing are assessed in Chapter 15.	
<b>16 Shipping and Navigation</b>						
Trinity House	TS S42 PEI1	18/06/2012	<p>The scoping response was forwarded also to Forewind as a Section 42 response to PEI1.</p> <p>The following to form part of the Environmental Statement:</p> <p>Navigation Risk Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Comprehensive vessel traffic analysis</li> <li>•The possible cumulative and in-combination effects on shipping routes and other vessel traffic patterns</li> </ul> <p>Risk Mitigation Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•marine aids to navigation</li> <li>•A decommissioning plan to include different risks</li> </ul>	Y	<p>Forewind has noted the comments made by Trinity House. Relevant information concerning surveys, cumulative impacts, decommissioning and mitigation have been included and can be found in Chapter 16 Shipping and Navigation</p> <p>Forewind has noted Trinity House's comments on cumulative impacts, decommissioning and navigational marking. These areas and any subsequent</p>	<p><b>16 Shipping and Navigation</b></p> <p><b>05 Project Description</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>•The possible requirement for navigational marking of the export and inter array cables and the vessels laying them.</p> <p>Wind farm will need to be marked by the developer/operator in accordance with general principles outlined in IALA Recommendation O-139.</p> <p>Cumulative and in-combination effects should be taken into account.</p> <p>When considering impacts with decommissioning, it should extend to a situation where it is not possible to remove all the obstructions.</p> <p>The possible requirement for navigational marking of the export and inter array cables and the vessels laying them. If it is necessary for the cables to be protected by rock armour, concrete mattresses or similar protection which lies clear of the surrounding seabed, the impact on navigation and the requirement for appropriate risk mitigation measures must be assessed. - Section 5</p>		mitigation have been addressed in Chapter 5 Project Description and Chapter 16 Shipping and Navigation	
<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>						
Cable and Wireless Worldwide	TS S42 PE11	30/05/2012	<p>Cable and Wireless never received Forewind's S42 letter - it went to the different department. Letter was resent on 29/05/2012.</p> <p>Cable and Wireless are happy to respond to S42 consultation before the deadline stated in the consultation letter. KGC pointed out consultation documents,</p>	N	Resending of a letter to Cable and Wireless to ensure they received the appropriate information	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			important project variables and in the email explained what Forewind is consulting on and which aspects C&W should can comment on.			
CEMEX UK Marine Ltd	TS S42 PEI1	12/06/2012	Cemex is in discussion with Forewind already regarding other phases of the development but would like to be considered in ongoing developments and assessments. Some specific areas have the potential to be impacted by the project.	N	Comments noted - Forewind will continue to show licence area in figures where appropriate and Cemex to remain on consultee list.	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
Centrica Energy	TS S42 PEI1	15/06/2012	Sent a map showing the relative positions of the relevant Centrica awarded licences.	N	Forewind received the map and noted the positions	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
Nexen Petroleum U.K. Limited	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	No objections/comments to the currently identified offshore infrastructure locations which are expected to be situated at least 55km from Nexen's licensed Blocks Nexen does however reserve its right to revise its position in case of any changes in the offshore development plans.	N	Forewind noted the comments and will update Nexen should this be required	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
Centrica Energy	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	Centrica has the exclusive licence (P1089) to search for, bore for and get hydrocarbons and natural gas from blocks 44/4a, 44/5 and 45/1. Tranche B overlies part of this area.  Zone is adjacent to Centrica's Cygnus Project in blocks 44/1a, 44/12a, 44/11b and 44/12b. One of Forewind's cable routes may also cross Cygnus blocks.  Wider ZDE overlaps with existing Centrica Upstream's Infrastructure in quadrants 47,	Y	Forewind has noted Centrica's comments concerning the interactions of projects, relevant information can be found in Chapter 17 Other Marine Users	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>48, 49 and is adjacent to their Dutch E blocks - E1, E2, E3, E4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- keep informed of project progress to find a positive co-existing solution for both parties (if required)</li> <li>- keep informed of respective offshore activities (survey, drilling, construction etc.). Exchange a schedule and description of offshore works (P1089 &amp; Cygnus &amp; Dutch E blocks)</li> <li>- exchange information relating to helicopter operations as a wind farm may impact Centrica's helicopter operations (P1089 &amp; Cygnus &amp; Dutch E Blocks)</li> <li>- Forewind to confirm that scouring impact studies are being carried out. Inform Centrica of the results (P1089 &amp; Cygnus &amp; Dutch E Blocks)</li> <li>- cables should be routed outwith the safety zone of Centrica's Cygnus facilities. Crossing/proximity agreements may be required</li> <li>- any work in proximity of existing facilities in blocks 47, 48, 49 may need a proximity agreement</li> </ul> <p>Believe successful co-existence is possible.</p>			
<b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology</b>						
North Yorkshire County Council	TS S42 PEI1	13/06/2012	The proposed development is within an area of high archaeological potential and natural England should be consulted.	Y	Forewind has noted North Yorkshire County Council's comments concerning the high	<b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
					archaeological potential of the area. The council's comments are addressed in Chapter 18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology and Chapter 27 Terrestrial Archaeology	<b>27 Terrestrial Archaeology</b>
English Heritage (Offshore developments)	TS Scoping	19/06/2012	<p>During operation we consider impacts associated with additional anti-scour materials to be a relevant consideration in reference to both export and inter-array cabling and turbines. Scour protection included in assessing the worst case scenario for archaeology for operational phase.</p> <p>The planning of this project must be fully informed by an adequate interpretation of geophysics survey data to identify anomalies with archaeological potential. The assessment has been informed by geophysical data from Tranche A, Tranche B and the Dogger Bank Teesside A &amp; B Export Cable Corridor.</p> <p>We stress the importance of the developer notifying us regarding further survey work. Commitment to archaeological involvement in future surveys is set out in the WSI to be agreed in further consultation with English Heritage. A high level WSI has been produced for Dogger Bank Teesside A &amp; B.</p>	Y	<p>Forewind has noted English Heritage (offshore developments) comments concerning anti-scour materials impacts, geophysics survey data and a WSI. These areas are covered in Chapter 9 Marine Physical Processes and Chapter 18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology. The WSI will not form part of the submission, but is available upon request.</p> <p>Forewind has noted English Heritage (offshore developments) comments concerning the WSI and impacts during construction, operation and decommissioning. These areas are covered in Chapter 18 Marine and coastal Archaeology. The WSI will not form part of the submission, but is available upon request.</p>	<p><b>9 Marine Physical Processes</b> <b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology, Sections 5 and 7</b></p> <p><b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology, Section 3</b> <b>Appendix 18A Archaeology and Cultural History Reports, appendices 1, 2 and 3</b></p> <p><b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology, Sections 6, 7 and 8</b></p> <p><b>The separate WSI is only referenced in the chapter and will not form part of the submission, but is</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>We will require the developer to produce, in agreement with us, an Archaeological WSI.</p> <p>A high level WSI has been produced for Dogger Bank Teesside A &amp; B. Scheme specific WSIs will be produced for each project and/or project element once the design is finalised and Method Statements for specific archaeological works will be produced, as required.</p> <p>The production of an archaeological WSI prior to development and in agreement with English Heritage should be prepared by a body affiliated to a professional association, such as the Institute for Archaeology.</p> <p>A WSI has been produced by Wessex Archaeology. Scheme specific WSIs will be produced by Wessex Archaeology. All required Method Statements will also be prepared by a body affiliated to a professional association.</p> <p>Attention directed at the planning and delivery of analysis which is corroborated by information obtained from any geotechnical and geophysical surveying campaign commissioned for this project. The assessment has been informed by geophysical and geotechnical data commissioned by Forewind for Dogger Bank Teesside A &amp; B and by palaeoenvironmental data from samples</p>			<p>available on request</p> <p><b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology, Sections 6, 7 and 8</b></p> <p><b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology, Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8</b></p> <p><b>The separate WSI is only referenced in the chapter and will not form part of the submission, but is available on request</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>recovered through ORPAD as reported by Forewind. Commitment to archaeological involvement in future surveys set out in the WSI to be agreed with English Heritage.</p> <p>Any archaeological reports produced as part of the WSI are to be agreed with English Heritage (and any relevant local authority) prior to the development commencing and the developer is also responsible for ensuring that copies of any agreed archaeological assessment reports are deposited with English Heritage. A WSI is to be submitted to English Heritage for approval. Consultation will continue with English Heritage with regard to scheme specific WSIs and Method Statements.</p> <p>The above requirement is completed by submitting an English Heritage OASIS (Online Access to the Index of archaeological investigations) form with a digital copy of the report. Notification of the completion of the OASIS form is to be sent, by the developer, to the relevant local authority for any aspect of this project that occurs within their area of responsibility for inclusion within any locally maintained Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>Requirement for OASIS submission is set out in the WSI. OASIS submission will be</p>			

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>dealt with on completion of the project.</p> <p>English Heritage supports action that delivers in situ protection and where this might not possible we must direct your attention to the UK Marine Policy Statement (published by HM Government and the Devolved Administrations in March 2011) to ensure that any to such action to disturb such sites takes full account of the historic environment. The avoidance of impacts through the application of Archaeological Exclusion Zones and through micro-siting forms the primary method of mitigation set out in the ES and WSI.</p> <p>We add also that the Environmental Statement for this project must set out how a reporting protocol will be produced and we direct your attention to The Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries: offshore renewables projects published by The Crown Estate in December 2010. The Offshore Renewables Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries is included as a key mitigation strategy for potential archaeological discoveries, as set out in WSI.</p>			
English Heritage (Offshore developments)	TS S42 PE11	22/06/2012	Rochdale Envelope approach - EH stated they must direct Forewind to ensure that assessment of impact to the historic environment is applied consistently (especially for foundation design).	Y	Forewind have noted the comments received from English Heritage (offshore developments) and have set an action to organise a meeting to discuss	<b>18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology</b>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>In P15.5 under 'localised nature of impacts' - low impact but there should be corroboration between desk-based sources of information and direct marine survey.</p> <p>English Heritage would like to review ZAP report once desk based studies included.</p> <p>P15.6.3 and 15.6.4 to consult EH on the specifications to be adopted for marine survey work. Draft archaeological investigation reports to be provided to EH.</p> <p>P15.6.5 - draft method statement to be provided for review as a part of an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). Any reports produced as a part to agree with EH.</p> <p>T15.1 - additional archaeological surveys- Forewind to remember about UK Marine Policy Statement (March 2011). The ES must set out how a formal protocol and watching brief will be produced.</p> <p>P18.3.12 - directed to the Historic Seascapes Characterisation programme.</p>		these points. Further information on methodologies and survey work can be found in Chapter 18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology	
<b>19 Military Activity and Civil Aviation</b>						
Civil Aviation Authority	TS Scoping	31/08/2012	Owing to the range of potential impacts upon aviation, the CAA requested that the findings of all aviation-related consultation	Y	Forewind has noted the Civil Aviation Authority's comments concerning consultation, turbine	<b>19 Military Activities and Civil Aviation, Sections 4</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>should be presented as well as the consideration of all potential issues.</p> <p>The CAA highlighted that consultation needs to be undertaken with aviation operators and service providers, specifically the MOD, NERL and offshore helicopter operators in order to identify any potential aviation concerns. - Section 4</p> <p>Highlighting the need to ensure maximum conspicuity of the turbines by night, the CAA stated that some or all of the turbines will need to be equipped with warning lighting. The relevant legal requirements are documented within Article 220 of the UK Air Navigation Order. - Section 9.1.2 and Chapter 5</p> <p>The CAA highlighted that meteorological masts are difficult to acquire [detect] visually and consideration should be given to lighting and marking of any masts required. - Section 9.1.2 and Chapter 5</p> <p>There is a requirement for turbines to be charted for aviation purposes. The Defence Geographic Centre (DGC) and CAA should be kept fully apprised of the wind farm's development. - Section 4</p>		<p>lighting, meteorological mast lighting and chartering of turbines. The comments are addressed in Chapter 5 Project Description and Chapter 19 Military Activity and Civil Aviation.</p> <p>Responses to consultation are included in the respective sections of this chapter where individual receptors and potential issues are considered in detail. Consultation has been undertaken with a number of stakeholders, with further consultation anticipated as the project progresses.</p> <p>Meteorological masts will be lit in accordance with the requirements of the ANO, and notified to the CAA and DGC for charting and marking purposes. Refer also to section 9.1.2 and Chapter 5.</p> <p>All turbines in the Dogger Bank will be charted for aviation purposes and the DGC and CAA will be kept fully apprised of the wind farm's development. Further details are provided in Section 4 of this chapter.</p>	<p><b>and 9.1.2</b></p> <p><b>05 Project Description</b></p> <p><b>19 Military Activities and Civil Aviation, Section 9.1.2</b></p> <p><b>19 Military Activities and Civil Aviation, Section 4</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
<b>20 Seascape and Visual Character</b>						
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	Concerning landscape/seascape and visual impacts of development, the key issues that require addressing will be: 1. Direct impacts, or physical change, to the landscape and/or seascape (i.e. impacts on the fabric/elements of the landscape/seascape, for example landform changes); 2. Indirect impacts on the character and quality of the landscape/seascape; 3. Direct impacts on the visual amenity of visual receptors, for example changes in views and their content for stakeholders; 4. Indirect impacts on visual receptors in different places, for example an altered visual perception leading to changes in public attitude, behaviour and how they value or use a place. As area is adjacent to the designated landscape of North Yorkshire & Cleveland Heritage Coast, consideration should be given to the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape and in particular the effect upon its purpose for designation	Y	Forewind has noted the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England's comments concerning landscape and seascape visual impacts. The assessment considers direct and indirect impacts on the seascape and views, as detailed in Sections 6, 7 and 8 of this report and Chapter 21 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	<b>20 Seascape and Visual Character, Sections 6, 7 and 8 21 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b>
<b>21 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b>						
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC)	TS Scoping	14/06/2012	Agreed that the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual	Y	Forewind noted comments from RCBC, and have followed the relevant guidance for LVIA. The method of assessment is stated	<b>Relevant guidance set out in Section 2.2 of Chapter 21 Landscape and</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			Impact Assessment (2 <sup>nd</sup> edition, 2002) and Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland (Countryside Agency & Scottish Natural Heritage) are the appropriate guidance to follow		with Chapter 21 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	<b>Visual Impact Assessment</b> Reference made to published guidance on landscape character in Section 4.3 and Tables 4.1 and 4.2.
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	Concerning landscape/seascape and visual impacts of development, the key issues that need to be focussed on will be: 1. Direct impacts, or physical change, to the landscape (i.e. impacts on the fabric/elements of the landscape, for example landform changes, vegetation changes); 2. Indirect impacts on the character and quality of the landscape; 3. Direct impacts on the visual amenity of visual receptors, for example changes in views and their content for stakeholders; 4. Indirect impacts on visual receptors in different places, for example an altered visual perception leading to changes in public attitude, behaviour and how they value or use a place. Proposals to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside will be encouraged, and links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate.	Y	The assessment considers direct and indirect impacts on the landscape and views, as detailed in Section 3, Methodology.  Relevant local authority green infrastructure strategies will be taken account of in the development of the detailed landscape design, post application, if practicable, and in liaison with the local authority. The proposal is located within an industrial complex. As such, public access and provision for recreation is not appropriate in this context.  Details of the development of the siting and design as it relates to local landscape character is described in Sections 5 and 6 of this draft ES chapter.	<b>21 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Section 3</b>  <b>21 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Sections 5 and 6</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			All new development should consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness. The siting and design of the proposed development should demonstrate that local design characteristics and, wherever possible, the use of local materials has been considered.			
English Heritage	TS Scoping	19/06/2012	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preferred landfall area may produce coastal considerations regarding archaeology (Wagon ruts on the rocks might exist; coastline known to contain areas of submerged forest)</li> <li>2. Setting of Kirkleatham Village &amp; Hall (conservation areas) is a material consideration for proposed converter station S4. Reference should be given to the Kirkleatham Conservation Plan S5 &amp; S6 lie near Wilton Conservation Area and Grade 1 listed church</li> <li>3. Converter Stations on Greenfield land needs archaeological evaluation</li> <li>4. Cable route on land with demonstrable archaeology</li> <li>5. Point at which the indicative cable area narrow to the south of Kirkleatham Hall is considered to be important as regard to parkland setting and key views and vistas in relations to the village of year by.</li> </ol>	Y	Forewind has noted the comments from English Heritage and has been taken into account during the site selection (See Chapter 6). The Terrestrial Archaeology assessment is detailed within Chapter 27.	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 27 Terrestrial Archaeology</b>
National Grid Electricity	TS S42 PE11	22/06/2012	National Grid would ask that the location of their transmission infrastructure and	Y	Forewind has noted comments from NGET and location of	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
Transmission (NGET)			<p>any potential impact of the proposed project on their infrastructure are taken into account in the Environmental Assessment and as part of any subsequent Development Consent Order application, including the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>NGET provided details on their OHLs and underground cables in the area.</p> <p>Forewind should take into consideration all health and safety requirements (electrical safety clearances, no trees planted above or within 3m of the existing underground cable etc.). Plans attached and links to literature provided.</p>		transmission infrastructure is considered as part of the wider site selection within Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	
<b>22 Socio-Economics</b>						
Loftus Town Council	TS S42 PE11	24/05/2012	Loftus Town Council attended the public exhibition and filled in the questionnaire. Response is categorised as S42 response as Loftus Town Council is S42 consultee. Comments from Town Council are very positive, in the TC opinion Forewind considered the best options (and 3 southerly sites are the most suitable for the TC) and addressed issues as well as possible at this stage. Loftus Town Council expects new employment for construction and maintenance phases.	N	Forewind notes the comments made by Loftus Town Council. The assessment has determined that job creation will result in both the regional and UK markets during construction (see Section 6.2, Chapter 22) and the operation (maintenance phase) (Section 7.1, Chapter 22).	<b>22 Socio-Economics, Sections 6.2 and 7.1</b>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
Scarborough Borough Council	TS Scoping	15/06/2012	The administrative area of Scarborough Borough is immediately adjacent to the study area, [and] includes the ports of Whitby and Scarborough as well as large areas of the North Yorkshire Moors National Park. Scarborough Borough Council therefore considers that the socioeconomic impact of the development as it affects the Borough should also be assessed both during construction and subsequent operation. The Council considers that the Recreational and Tourist impact on the Borough should also be included and that such impacts on the North Yorkshire Moors National Park should not be scoped out. The Moors provide a significant asset for Teesside and many Teesside residents and visitors use it for recreational and tourism. The 5km distance from the study area is not considered a sufficient reason to exclude these impacts from the assessment.	Y	Forewind notes the comments made by Scarborough Borough Council. Forewind has not made a decision in relation to ports to be used for construction of the wind farm. As such, it is not possible to present a meaningful assessment of socio-economic impacts of the influx of workers at a named port town. Once a construction port has been confirmed, Forewind will work with the port authority and relevant local authority to ensure that any effects are adequately understood and measures proposed where relevant	<b>23 Tourism &amp; Recreation</b>
<b>23 Tourism &amp; Recreation</b>						
Scarborough Borough Council	TS Scoping	15/06/2012	The potential impacts listed in the Scoping Report relate to positive impacts. The assessment must also assess any negative socio-economic effects that may arise, including the impacts upon the commercial fishing and tourism and recreation. The Recreational and Tourist impact on the Borough should also be included and that such impacts on the North Yorkshire Moors National Park	Y	Forewind welcomes the comments from Scarborough Borough Council. Impacts on tourism and recreation are discussed in full throughout Chapter 23. Impacts upon fisheries are discussed in full in Chapter 15 Commercial Fisheries. Impacts on socio-economics are discussed in full in Chapter 22	<b>15 Commercial Fisheries 22 Socio-Economics 23 Tourism &amp; Recreation, Section 6 and throughout chapter</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			should not be scoped out as is proposed... The Moors provide a significant asset for Teesside and many Teesside residents and visitors use it for recreational and tourism. The 5km distance from the study area is not considered a sufficient reason to exclude these impacts from the assessment.		Socio-economics. The North York Moors National Park has been scoped into the impact assessment and the assessment of impacts to this feature is described in Section 6, Chapter 23.	
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways are to be encouraged. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should consider potential impacts on access land, public open land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the adjacent/nearby Cleveland Way National Trail...Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts.	Y	Forewind welcomes the comments provided by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England. Potential impacts to footpaths, bridleways and other Public Rights of Way (PRoW) are discussed in Section 6, Chapter 23. The EIA considers public open land and PRoW and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development in Section 6. Consideration has also been given to the Cleveland Way National Trail. Appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated for any adverse impacts.	<b>23 Tourism &amp; Recreation, Section 6</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
<b>24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality</b>						
Environment Agency	TS Scoping	19/06/2012	Under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 any proposals to deposit, treat, store or dispose of any waste material may require an Environmental Permit or specific exemption obtained from the Environment Agency. The project will require the preparation of a Site Waste Management Plan in accordance with the Site Waste Management Plan Regulations 2008. The developer should consider how they can incorporate recycled/recovered materials into the building programme. The developer is encouraged to commit to the Government's Waste Recycling Action Programme's (WRAP) Halving Construction and Demolition Waste to Landfill by 2012 policy, if they have not already done so.	Y	Forewind have noted response received from the Environment Agency, and have undertaken full consultation with them during not only the Flood Risk Assessment, but only WFD, water resources and waste management elements of the EIA for Chapter 24 and its associated appendices.	<b>24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality.</b>
Environment Agency	TS S42 PEI1	29/06/2012	Additional comments to the Scoping Opinion (TS_Scoping Response_EA_19062012):  EA would welcome the opportunity to meet with Forewind and discuss. Comments on PEI1: -a sequential approach and rationale to be presented - flood risk - laying cables within flood zones is not a concern to EA, but reinstatement of ground levels to the pre-construction level would be expected.	Y	Forewind have noted response received from the Environment Agency, and have undertaken full consultation with them during the site selection elements of the proposal, in particularly the converter station site selection.	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate measures for crossing watercourses required.</li> <li>- surface water drainage from these sites to be considered.</li> <li>- there are many sea defences along this coastal stretch - HDD method should be used. New defences will be built- Forewind should contact EA as soon as will have the preferred landfall location.</li> <li>- coastal erosion to be taken into account.</li> <li>- prior written consent of the EA is required for: any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 5 metres of the top of the bank of the main river; structures either affecting or within 5 metres of the tidal or fluvial flood defence; any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse.</li> </ul>			
<b>25 Terrestrial Ecology</b>						
North York Moors National Park	TS S42 PE11	14/05/2012	North York Moors National Park provided some comments on ornithology impact assessment (migratory waders, merlin, other seabirds that breed on the NYM coast) before the start of the consultation period.	N	Forewind requested that North York Moors National Park respond to the formal scoping consultation to ensure their comments are considered by the NID. Planning Inspectorate confirmed on 25/6/2012 that they had received NYMNP's response to Scoping.	<b>N/A</b>
North York Moors National Park	TS Scoping	11/06/2012	The EIA should address the issue of whether the wind farm is likely to affect the feeding patterns of seabirds which nest along the coastal cliffs and makeup	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the North York Moors National Park. Impacts to coastal breeding birds will be avoided	<b>05 Project Description 25 Terrestrial Ecology, Section</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			part of the diverse ecology of the National Park natural environment.		through the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), in addition to a suite of mitigation measures to minimise disturbance to seabirds during construction outlined in Section 6.4 of Chapter 25.	<b>6.4</b>
North Yorkshire County Council	TS S42 PEI1	13/06/2012	Cumulative impacts require consideration for onshore and offshore and thorough assessment of both the onshore and offshore ecological impacts (in particular the impacts upon marine ecology, including nationally important sea bird populations).	Y	Forewind noted the comments from North Yorkshire County Council and cumulative impacts have been considered within the chapter in Section 10. Offshore cumulative impacts in relation to ornithology are covered in Chapter 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology.	<b>11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology 25 Terrestrial Ecology, Section 10</b>
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	Consider the likelihood that the proposal will have a significant effect on internationally designated sites and therefore will require assessment under the Habitats Regulations. Full consideration of impacts on habitats and species, including: • Historical survey data; • Status of habitats and species; • Development effects; and • Mitigation or compensation details. Ornithological studies should include surveys of wintering, breeding and passage species which are qualifying features of the Special Protection Area (SPA), and impacts including direct habitat loss, displacement and disturbance should be considered. Inter-relationships - to take an ecosystem	Y	Forewind noted the comments from the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England and an assessment has been undertaken as part of the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). Impacts on all appropriate ecological receptors has been undertaken and reported within the draft ES. Two years wintering bird data and one year passage and migration data has been obtained. See also Chapter 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology.	<b>08 Designated Sites 11 Marine and Coastal Ornithology 25 Terrestrial Ecology Habitats Regulation Assessment</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			approach and consider inter-relationships when looking at impacts.			
<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>						
Envoy Asset Management Limited, Independent Power Networks Limited, Independent Pipelines Limited & Quadrant Pipelines Limited	TS S42 PEI1	06/06/2012	Envoy Asset Management provided plans of their gas networks in the area and safety instructions. Confirmed that they do not operate any electricity infrastructure in the area.	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from Envoy, information on utilities are included within Section 4.2 of Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture	<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture, Section 4.2</b>
ICI Chemicals & Polymers Limited	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	<p>Following conversation with DM ICI Chemicals &amp; Polymers provided comments on the onshore proposal - Bran Sands Site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Bran Sands site is regulated by an environmental permit, which remains in place and site cannot be split.</li> <li>2. The site has been capped to a standard agreed with the Environment Agency and based on a risk assessment. All excavations would require the involvement of the EA.</li> <li>3. There is an obligation to manage landfill gas on the site.</li> <li>4. The Site was used for over 40 years for the disposal of industrial waste.</li> <li>5. Phase 1 of the site has the NW water treatment plant on it on a long term lease.</li> <li>6. There is a complex network of way leaves and pipe corridors on the perimeter</li> </ol>	Y	Forewind noted the comments from ICI concerning an onshore proposal site further information on site selection can be found in Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives and ground contamination can be found in Chapter 24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality</b>



Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			of the site.			
Joint Nature Conservation Committee / Natural England	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	<p>1. In JNCC and NE view it is likely that proposal will have a significant effect on internationally designated sites and therefore will require assessment under the Habitats Regulations and included in a separate section of the ES entitled „Information for Habitats Regulations Assessment“. Ornithological studies should include surveys of wintering, breeding and passage species which are qualifying features of the SPA, and impacts including direct habitat loss, displacement and disturbance should be considered.</p> <p>2. The ES should include details of: Any historical data for the site affected by the proposal (e.g. from previous surveys); Additional surveys carried out as part of this proposal; The habitats and species present; The status of these habitats and species (e.g. whether BAP priority habitat); The direct and indirect effects of the development upon those habitats and species; Full details of any mitigation or compensation that might be required</p> <p>3. NE encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment.</p> <p>4. The EIA should consider potential impacts on access land, public open land, rights of way and coastal access routes in</p>	Y	Forewind have noted the response from the Joint Nature Conservation Committee and Natural England, and where appropriate the issues raised have been considered within Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture. Where those items are inter-related, these have been considered within Section 9 of the Chapter	<p><b>21 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b></p> <p><b>25 Terrestrial Ecology</b></p> <p><b>28 Traffic and Access</b></p> <p><b>04 EIA Process</b></p> <p><b>05 Project Description (including offshore noise modelling)</b></p> <p><b>23 Tourism and Recreation</b></p>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>the vicinity of the development and potential impacts on the adjacent/nearby Cleveland Way National Trail.</p> <p>5. The EIA process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the design of the converter station will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit</p> <p>6. The ES should consider whether there is land in the area affected by the development qualifying for conditional exemption from capital taxes on the grounds of outstanding scenic, scientific or historic interest.</p> <p>7. The project description should include: Construction (including information on project management and timetabling, equipment, delivery routes, facilities). Operation &amp; Maintenance - should include those activities and an assessment of any impacts (scour protection and cable reburial, considering any potential environmental, navigational and/or other effects). Decommissioning - should also be considered, and reviewed, at this (pre-application) stage, with an options appraisal presented in the ES.</p> <p>9. Decommissioning and Replanting should be detailed and assessed as fully as possible.</p>			
Northumbrian Water Limited	TS S42 PE11	19/06/2012	Northumbrian Water provided a contact for asset protection and requested	Y	Forewind have noted the response from Northumbrian	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			another copy of PEI1 on CD. They asked us for a meeting once cable route and converter station sites were more defined (approx. by end of August 2012).		Water, the cable route and converter station sites and location is considered within Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>
GTC Pipelines Limited	TS S42 PEI1	21/06/2012	Asked for confirmation of where the projects are	N	Forewind noted this and responded to inform GTC of the project locations	<b>N/A</b>
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	TS S42 PEI1	22/06/2012	National Grid would ask that the location of their transmission infrastructure and any potential impact of the proposed project on their infrastructure are taken into account in the Environmental Assessment and as part of any subsequent Development Consent Order application, including the Environmental Statement.	Y	Forewind have noted the response from National Grid, and is considered within Section 4.2 of Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture	<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture, Section 4.2</b>
GTC Pipelines Limited	TS S42 PEI1	28/06/2012 (Received later than the final deadline)	Provided copies of maps showing the location of their gas pipelines in Teesside.	Y	Forewind have noted the comments from GTC Pipelines Limited, information on utilities are included within Section 4.2 of Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture	<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture, Section 4.2</b>
<b>27 Terrestrial Archaeology</b>						
English Heritage	TS Scoping	19/06/2012	1. Preferred landfall area may produce coastal considerations regarding archaeology (Wagon ruts on the rocks might exist; coastline known to contain areas of submerged forest) 2. Setting of Kirkleatham Village & Hall (conservation areas) is a material consideration for proposed converter	Y	Forewind noted comments received from English Heritage, which fed into the site selection process and Chapter 27 Terrestrial Archaeology.	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 27 Terrestrial Archaeology</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>station S4. Reference should be given to the Kirkleatham Conservation Plan S5 &amp; S6 lie near Wilton Conservation Area and Grade 1 listed church</p> <p>3. Converter Stations on Greenfield land needs archaeological evaluation</p> <p>4. Cable route on land with demonstrable archaeology</p> <p>5. Point at which the indicative cable area narrow to the south of Kirkleatham Hall is considered to be important as regard to parkland setting and key views and vistas in relations to the village of year by.</p>			
English Heritage North East Office	TS S42 PE11	20/06/2012	<p>English Heritage North East responded to the PI scoping exercise and forwarded their answer to Forewind.</p> <p>EH North East confirmed that Forewind has been following best practice for offshore geotechnical and geophysical aspects.</p> <p>Confirmed that EH identified no obvious or absolute show-stoppers at this stage.</p> <p>- If site No.2 pursued, this would land the cabling within a Green Wedge in the adopted Core Strategy for Redcar &amp; Cleveland. It would, however, avoid known assets within the Marske Conservation Area and some Grade II listed buildings outwith that being the closest. Further archaeology assessment to be done.</p> <p>- Site Nos. 1,2 and 3 - less likely to be so</p>	Y	Forewind noted comments received from English Heritage, which fed into the site selection process and Chapter 27 Terrestrial Archaeology.	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 27 Terrestrial Archaeology</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>sensitive overall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site No. 4 close to Conservation Area, and several important Grade I and II* listed buildings and structures.</li> <li>- Site Nos. 5 and 6 - lie near to Wilton Conservation Area and a Grade I listed church, some on greenfield sites. Archaeological evaluation would be needed.</li> <li>-For cable corridors it is important that the archaeological potential of any proposed route is investigated.</li> <li>-The Conservation Plan for Kirkleatham should be referenced in preparing the EIA.</li> </ul>			
<b>28 Traffic and Access</b>						
The Highways Agency	TS S42 PEI1	21/06/2012	<p>The infrastructure presented by Forewind includes A1053 and A174 which are the part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN)-primary interest to the HA.</p> <p>Considerations to be given to the policy provisions in Circular 02/2007 (par 41, 42 &amp; 43) - new access.</p> <p>The appropriate information about the traffic volumes and resultant impact at the SRN to be provided.</p> <p>Recommended to consult with HA Abnormal Loads team regarding the transportation of the abnormal loads to the site.</p> <p>HA would like to be informed about the substation location - once finalised.</p> <p>Decommissioning impacts will be similar</p>	Y	Forewind noted comments from the Highways Agency. This was fed into the EIA process. In response to the issues raised by the HA in their response to the Scoping Report, a transport specific scoping note was submitted that sought to provide greater detail in regard to the likely project traffic demand.	<b>28 Traffic and Access.</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
			<p>to those from construction - details not know as yet.</p> <p>HA would like to be informed about the other developments in the area and cumulative impacts.</p> <p>If any trunk roads affected - Forewind should consult with the HA.</p> <p>The scope of Forewind's assessment is appropriate and HA would like to be consulted in relations to the specific considerations of the SRN.</p> <p>HA would like to see Forewind give consideration to the actual vehicular impact rather than the percentage impact.</p> <p>More details to be included in the Traffic Assessment - to clarify likely type, scale and location of impacts associated with this element.</p> <p>Suggested to provide copy of the EIA to the HA for comments.</p> <p>Any road closures or diversions that can affect SRN - to be discussed with the HA.</p> <p>A full construction management plan should be provided taking account of specific detail requested by the HA in the scoping response</p>			
<b>29 Noise and Vibration</b>						
<b>30 Air Quality</b>						
Joint Nature Conservation	TS S42 PEI1	19/06/2012	Scoping Report Chapter 27 Air Quality proposes to scope out offshore sources of	Y	Forewind noted comments from the Joint Nature Conservation	<b>30 Air Quality, Sections 6 and 7</b>

Consultee	Stage	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Influence on Project Proposal (Y/N)	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
Committee / Natural England			air pollution due to the distance from receptors, presumably meaning terrestrial Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and sensitive habitats. However, it would be helpful to have the contribution of the construction and maintenance works, to wider air quality and climate change, outlined and quantified in the EIA. Best practice for minimising this contribution through all works and materials should also be considered.		Committee and Natural England regarding the scoping out of offshore sources of air pollution.	





**DOGGER BANK  
TEESSIDE A & B**

**March  
2014**

# Consultation Report

## Appendix I.3

Summary of responses received from Section 44 consultees during the first phase of statutory consultation and the regard that Forewind has had to responses received

**Doc.No. F-STL-RP-001**

**Application Reference 5.1.9**

Consultee	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
TS_PEI1 S47_Q18	24/05/2012	The resident has a positive feel about the development as this is the only alternative in the moment; site selection process is ok and does not have comments on converter station and landfall location.	Forewind noted the positive response questionnaire	<b>21 Seascape &amp; Landscape Visual Character</b>
Egdon Resources (UK) Limited	29/05/2012	Egdon notified us that they have a wellsite at Kirkleatham and a pipeline within the onshore cable area. Provided maps and contact details. Forewind acknowledged receipt and said we will be in touch if a crossing is required.	Forewind noted the response and the location of the pipeline and wellsite. Forewind mapped these features and will contact Egdon if a crossing is required	<b>26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>
Sembcorp Utilities (UK) Limited Scu (UK)	29/05/2012	Forewind provided feedback to Sembcorp on the Lazenby public exhibition ahead of Sembcorp's meeting with the Lazenby Environmental Group.  Sembcorp provided copies of the letter between ICI and the Lazenby Environmental Group regarding a commitment to only use the land south of the power station for development with a low visual and environmental impact (dated 1990), and the MOM for a council meeting regarding the Instrument of Consent (dated 1991).	Forewind noted the letters received from Sembcorp and will take the comments within them on board during the design process	<b>07 Consultation 21 Seascape &amp; Landscape Visual Character 26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>
Cable and Wireless Worldwide	30/05/2012	Cable and Wireless never received Forewind's S42 letter - it went to the different department. Letter was resent on 29/05/2012.  Forewind spoke with Cable and Wireless and they are happy to respond to S42 consultation before the deadline stated in the consultation letter. Forewind pointed out consultation documents, important project variables and in the email explained what Forewind is consulting on and which aspects C&W should can comment on.	Forewind noted that Cable and Wireless had not received the relevant documentation and followed up on this, directing Cable and Wireless to the documents and the areas that should be focused upon	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
CEMEX UK Marine Ltd	12/06/2012	Cemex is in discussion with Forewind already regarding other phases of the development but	Comments noted - Forewind will continue to show licence area in	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>

Consultee	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
		would like to be considered in ongoing developments and assessments.  Areas 466 and 485 have the potential to be impacted by the project.  (Cemex attended the navigation hazard workshop and want to be kept up to date).	figures where appropriate + Cemex to remain on consultee list.	
Centrica Energy	13/06/2012	Minutes and meeting between Centrica and Forewind held 13 June 2012. It was agreed at this meeting to communicate with each other regarding developments in and around Dogger Bank and that any potential issues are discussed with the aim of amicable resolution.	Forewind noted the minutes from the meeting and the agreement to communicate developments between groups	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
York Potash Project	14/06/2012	York Potash Project scheme includes a proposal for a pipeline to Teesside, which means that DB projects may come into contact. Forewind had not appreciated this until now.  Forewind sent the main figure showing the proposed location of the onshore works, explained the proposal and provided the links where the consultation material can be found.  Asked York Potash Project to confirm if they would like more time to respond to consultation.	Forewind noted the comments and will continue to liaise with York Potash Project	<b>07 Consultation 26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>
Centrica Energy	15/06/2012	Centrica sent Forewind an email with a map showing the relative positions of the relevant Centrica awarded licences. These are licence P1899 (blocks 44/4a, 44/5 and 45/1) and the Dutch E blocks (E1, E2, E4, E5).	Forewind noted the locations from Centrica and will continue to liaise on offshore areas going forward	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
ICI Chemicals & Polymers Limited	15/06/2012	Forewind met ICI and following the meeting sent an email clarifying the significance of a "Key Project Area" as shown in the consultation documents. Attached a copy of exhibition display boards. Asked for any further	Forewind noted the comments and will continue to liaise with ICI on this issue	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>

Consultee	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
		<p>comments.</p> <p>ICI advised that the area in general is heavily utilised by underground cables and pipes etc. and doubted whether any further underground infrastructure could be installed.</p>		
National Grid Gas Plc	19/06/2012	National Grid informed Forewind to use the Plant Protection contact details for all gas enquiries.	Forewind noted the request and updated the contact details to ensure this process was followed	<b>07 Consultation</b>
ICI Chemicals & Polymers Limited	19/06/2012	<p>Following conversation with DM ICI Chemicals &amp; Polymers provided comments on the onshore proposal - Bran Sands Site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Bran Sands site is regulated by an environmental permit, which remains in place and site cannot be split.</li> <li>2. The site has been capped to a standard agreed with the Environment Agency and based on a risk assessment. All excavations would require the involvement of the EA.</li> <li>3. There is an obligation to manage landfill gas on the site.</li> <li>4. The Site was used for over 40 years for the disposal of industrial waste.</li> <li>5. Phase 1 of the site has the NW water treatment plant on it on a long term lease.</li> <li>6. There is a complex network of way leaves and pipe corridors on the perimeter of the site.</li> </ol>	Forewind noted the points raised in discussion with ICI and will consider them going forward in the site selection process	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives</b> <b>26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>
Northumbrian Water Limited	19/06/2012	Northumbrian Water provided a contact for asset protection and requested another copy of PEI1 on CD. They asked us for a meeting once cable route and converter station sites were more defined (approx. by end of August 2012).	Forewind have noted the response from Northumbrian Water, the cable route and converter station sites and location is considered within Chapter 6 Assessment of Alternatives	<b>24 Geology, Water Resources and Land Quality</b> <b>26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>
Wilton Centre (No 1) Limited	20/06/2012	They referred to the Forewind's letter dated 15 June 2012 - reminder of the consultation deadline and stated that this is the first they and	Forewind confirmed that they have been dealing with a different contact at Wilton (not the legal team).	<b>07 Consultation</b>

Consultee	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
		<p>their client have heard about the consultation. Their client would like to review the consultation information and it is not possible to do in the timeframes referred to in Forewind's letter. They requested the copies of the correspondence the client should have received. They do not consider that the client has been consulted with properly.</p> <p>Forewind contacted the Wilton Centre directly who confirmed that they do not have any concerns about the consultation documents. This was a mis-communication with their legal team.</p>	<p>The Wilton Centre recognised the confusion re the Hogan Lovells letter. Confirmed that Wilton Centre does not have any concerns about the consultation documents.</p>	
Tata Steel UK Limited	21/06/2012	<p>Tata Steel agreed to meet Forewind on 31/07/2012.</p> <p>Unable to provide land around S1 and S2 - commercial aspects.</p> <p>There is a possibility for the land around S3 - this will be checked by Tata Steel.</p>	<p>Forewind noted the comments made and removed S1 and S2 from site options</p> <p>Forewind followed up on the availability of S3</p>	<b>06 Assessment of Alternatives 26 Land Use and Agriculture</b>
Nexen Petroleum U.K. Limited	22/06/2012	<p>No objections/comments to the currently identified offshore infrastructure locations which are expected to be situated at least 55km from Nexen's licensed Blocks 38/10, 39/6 and 39/7.</p> <p>Nexen does however reserve its right to revise its position in case of any changes in the offshore development plans.</p>	<p>Forewind noted that Nexen had no comments at this point in time</p>	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
Centrica Energy	22/06/2012	<p>A response from Centrica, highlighting their land interests offshore that will be relevant to the Dogger Bank Teesside projects.</p>	<p>Forewind noted the locations from Centrica and will continue to liaise on offshore areas going forward</p>	<b>17 Other Marine Users</b>
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	22/06/2012	<p>National Grid would ask that the location of their transmission infrastructure and any potential impact of the proposed project on their infrastructure are taken into account in the</p>	<p>Forewind has noted comments from NGET and location of transmission infrastructure is considered as part of the wider site selection within Chapter</p>	<b>21 Seascape &amp; Landscape Visual Character</b>

Consultee	Date Received	Detailed Summary of Response	Regard had to Response	Chapter Reference
		<p>Environmental Assessment and as part of any subsequent Development Consent Order application, including the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>NGET provided details on their OHLs and underground cables in the area.</p> <p>Forewind should take into consideration all health and safety requirements (electrical safety clearances, no trees planted above or within 3m of the existing underground cable etc.). Plans attached and links to literature provided.</p>	<p>6 Assessment of Alternatives</p> <p>Forewind have noted the response from National Grid, and is considered within Section 4.2 of Chapter 26 Land Use and Agriculture</p>	
Centrica Energy	17/07/2012	Centrica confirmation of the minutes taken at the meeting with Forewind held on 13/06/2012	Forewind noted that the minutes were confirmed by Centrica	<b>07 Consultation 17 Other Marine Users</b>