

## The Great Grid Upgrade

Eastern Green Link 3 (EGL 3) and  
Eastern Green Link 4 (EGL 4)

# Preliminary environmental information report (PEIR)

Volume 2, Part 1, Appendix 1.2.B Marine Plan Assessment  
May 2025

# Contents

---

<b>1.2.B. Appendix 1.2.B Marine Plan Assessment</b>	<b>1</b>
1.2.B.1 Overview	1
1.2.B.2 East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan Assessment	2
1.2.B.3 Northeast Inshore and Northeast Offshore Marine Plans	18

# 1.2.B. Appendix 1.2.B Marine Plan Assessment

## 1.2.B.1 Overview

1.2.B.1.1 This appendix presents the preliminary Marine Plan Assessment for the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans (2014) and the Northeast Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan (2021). This presents the details of the aspects relevant to the environmental aspect chapters in **Volume 1, Part 3 English Offshore Scheme** of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).

## 1.2.B.2 East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan Assessment

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
<b>Economic</b>	EC1	Proposals that provide economic productivity benefits which are additional to Gross Value Added currently generated by existing activities should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme would provide economic productivity benefits where possible.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	EC2	Proposals that provide additional employment benefits should be supported, particularly where these benefits have the potential to meet employment needs in localities close to the Marine Plan areas.	The English Offshore Scheme would provide job opportunities to the local area where possible.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	EC3	Proposals that would help the East Marine Plan areas to contribute to offshore wind energy generation should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with offshore wind energy generation.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Social and Cultural</b>	SOC1	Proposals that provide health and social well-being benefits including through maintaining, or enhancing, access to the coast and offshore area should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with the enhancement of health and social well-being benefits.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	SOC2	Proposals that may affect heritage assets should demonstrate, in order of preference:	Potential impacts of the English Offshore Scheme on heritage assets are considered in a Marine Archaeological Technical Report carried out by MSDS in Chapter 35 – Marine Archaeology. The potential effects that the	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
		<p>a) that they would not compromise or harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset</p> <p>b) how, if there is compromise or harm to a heritage asset, this would be minimised</p> <p>c) how, where compromise or harm to a heritage asset cannot be minimised, it would be mitigated against or</p> <p>d) the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate compromise or harm to the heritage asset.</p>	<p>Proposed Works may have such as damage to/loss of archaeological material from direct/indirect impacts have all been found to have a minor or negligible impact. Known receptors would be avoided through the application of Archaeological Exclusion Zones, Temporary Archaeological Exclusion Zones (TAEZs) and subsequent micro-siting of infrastructure on the seabed, as necessary.</p>	
	SOC3	<p>Proposals that may affect the Onshore and Offshore character of an area should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they would not adversely impact the Onshore and Offshore character of an area</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on the Onshore and Offshore character of an area, they would minimise them</p> <p>c) how, where these adverse impacts on the Onshore and Offshore character of an area cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated against</p>	<p>The Anderby Creek Landfall would be constructed using horizontal directional drilling (HDD) or other trenchless solution. Once the English Offshore Scheme have been installed no above ground infrastructure would remain. Th effects related to Onshore character are assessed in Volume 1, Part 2 of the PEIR.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
		d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.		
Ecosystem	ECO1	Cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem of the East Marine Plans and adjacent areas (marine, Onshore) should be addressed in decision-making and plan implementation.	Potential cumulative impacts affecting the local ecosystem would be considered in the cumulative effects assessment which would be provided in the ES.	N/A
	ECO2	The risk of release of hazardous substances as a secondary effect due to any increased collision risk should be taken account of in proposals that require an authorisation.	A navigational risk assessment has been undertaken, and collision risk has been considered in the Shipping and Navigation chapter (Chapter 32). Most impacts that the Proposed works may have on Shipping and Navigation such as reduction in under-keel clearance and increased risk of vessel collisions during construction and operational phases was found to be minor or negligible and therefore not a potential significant effect. The assessment determined that the likely effect of the Proposed Works, specifically Project vessels blocking navigational features would have a very probable impact with a severe severity which resulted in an overall predicted effect of moderate. This was also the determined overall effect on disturbance to existing shipping patterns. The assessment also concluded that there is no potential for international transboundary impacts. The environmental measures that are characterised as either design, control or	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
			management measures would be implemented to reduce the Proposed Works potential impacts on Shipping and Navigation.	
<b>Biodiversity</b>	BIO1	Appropriate weight should be attached to biodiversity, reflecting the need to protect biodiversity, taking account of the best available evidence including on habitats and species that are protected or of conservation concern in the East Marine Plans and adjacent areas (marine, Onshore).	Potential impacts of biodiversity are considered in the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA), Marine Conservation Assessment (MCZ) and Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment. With mitigations in place no significant impacts are anticipated.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	BIO2	Where appropriate, proposals for development should incorporate features that enhance biodiversity and geological interests.	The English Offshore Scheme would seek to incorporate nature inclusive design where appropriate	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Marine Protected Areas</b>	MPA1	Any impacts on the overall Marine Protected Area network must be taken account of in strategic level measures and assessments, with due regard given to any current agreed advice on an ecologically coherent network.	<p>The English Offshore Scheme does overlap several protected areas, including Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) within the East Marine Plan areas. Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA), Marine Conservation Assessment (MCZ) and Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment have been undertaken to considered these.</p> <p>The works are of short duration and the route was refined to minimise interactions with protected sites as much as possible, so no potential significant effects are predicted.</p>	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
<b>Climate Change</b>	CC1	<p>Proposals should take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how they may be impacted upon by, and respond to, climate change over their lifetime and</li> <li>• how they may impact upon any climate change adaptation measures elsewhere during their lifetime</li> </ul> <p>Where detrimental impacts on climate change adaptation measures are identified, evidence should be provided as to how the proposal would reduce such impacts.</p>	<p>The Project would not significantly contribute to climate change. The works helps mitigate the impacts of climate change by facilitating the transfer of renewable energy, contributes to Net Zero and is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). Therefore, it is predicted that the Project would have a positive impact on climate change.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>
	CC2	<p>Proposals for development should minimise emissions of greenhouse gases as far as is appropriate. Mitigation measures would also be encouraged where emissions remain following minimising steps. Consideration should also be given to emissions from other activities or users affected by the proposal.</p>	<p>The primary source of greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Project is from construction vessels. Compliance of all project vessels with the regulations relating to International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (the MARPOL Convention 73/78), with the aim of preventing and minimising pollution from ships. It is not expected that the Project would cause a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>
<b>Governance</b>	GOV1	<p>Appropriate provision should be made for infrastructure on land which supports activities in the Offshore area and vice versa.</p>	<p>The Anderby Creek Landfall would be constructed using HDD or similar trenchless solution. Four cable ducts (i.e., two ducts for EGL 3 and two for EGL 4) would be installed from the Transition Joint Bay (TJB), positioned</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
			above the MHWS mark, to a point below 0 m lowest astronomical tide (LAT).	
			The Application includes both Offshore and Onshore land-based infrastructure and would facilitate activity in both Offshore and Onshore systems. The cable route extends from the Offshore environment above MHWS, before continuing onshore to a substation located in Kings Lynn, West Norfolk.	
	GOV2	Opportunities for co-existence should be maximised wherever possible.	<p>EGL 3 and EGL 4 are separate projects that are being developed jointly with co-location of infrastructure at the landfall.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with other third parties at the landfall.</p> <p>The Applicant would also engage with fishermen and other Offshore users. The Applicant would develop a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (an outline of which has been submitted with the Application) that sets out measures to promote the co-existence of commercial fishing and offshore wind farm development. A Navigational Risk Assessment would be implemented to minimise all potential impacts to acceptable or tolerable risk levels as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP).</p>	Does not hinder objectives.
	GOV3	Proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:	The routing and siting of the EGL 3 and EGL 4 infrastructure has taken into consideration all other existing, planned or proposed schemes	Does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
		<p>a) that they would avoid displacement of other existing or authorised (but to be implemented) activities</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, they would minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated against or</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts of displacement.</p>	<p>or activities. The English Offshore Scheme have sought to avoid where possible other activities and infrastructure. Where avoidance is not possible, displacement would be short term and temporary during the construction phase.</p>	
<b>Defence</b>	DEF1	<p>Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence Danger and Exercise Areas should not be authorised without agreement from the Ministry of Defence.</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme is routed through a number of MoD Danger and Exercise area, effects would be temporary and short-term during construction of EGL 3 and EGL 4. The Applicant is engaging with the MoD.</p>	<p>Does not hinder objectives</p>
<b>Oil and Gas</b>	OG1	<p>Proposals within areas with existing oil and gas production should not be authorised except where compatibility with oil and gas production and infrastructure can be satisfactorily demonstrated.</p>	<p>There are 13 active pipelines and 11 that are not in use or are abandoned which cross the draft Order Limits within the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan areas. There are 6 extant licensed oil and gas blocks which the draft Order Limits would pass through within the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan areas.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
			<p>Agreements would be made where crossing of oil and gas assets are required, this is standard practice and common place in the offshore environment. Methods would be agreed in terms of the design of the crossing and once</p>	
	OG2	<p>Proposals for new oil and gas activity should be supported over proposals for other development.</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme is not within an area where a license for new oil and gas infrastructure has been granted or formally applied for.</p> <p>Cable infrastructure and oil and gas activities can co-exist.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>
<p><b>Offshore Wind Renewable Energy</b></p>	WIND1	<p>Developments requiring authorisation, that are in or could affect sites held under a lease or an agreement for lease that has been granted by The Crown Estate for development of an Offshore Wind Farm should not be authorised unless</p> <p>a) they can clearly demonstrate that they would not compromise the construction, operation, maintenance, or decommissioning of the Offshore Wind Farm</p> <p>b) the lease/agreement for lease has been surrendered back to The Crown Estate and not been re-tendered</p>	<p>There are 3 offshore wind farms (OWFs) within the EGL 3 and EGL 4 study area in the Eastern Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan areas, all of which are fully operational. In addition, there are a number of export cables from Offshore Wind Farms that lie adjacent to or are proposed to cross the draft Order Limits.</p> <p>The EGL 3 and EGL 4 projects do not overlap with any Offshore Wind Farm Array, either operational or planned.</p> <p>Where cable infrastructure is to be crossed, agreements would be made with developers to agree the method and design of the crossing. This is standard practice and common place in the offshore environment.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy Code</b>	<b>Policy Text</b>	<b>Assessment of Policy Plan</b>	<b>Include/Not Include in Assessment</b>
		<p>c) the lease/agreement for lease has been terminated by the Secretary of State</p> <p>d) in other exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>Consultation with Offshore Wind Farm Developers is ongoing and would continue as plans develop.</p> <p>EGL 3 and EGL 4 would not comprise the development of operational or planned Offshore Wind Farms.</p>	
	WIND2	Proposals for Offshore Wind Farms inside Round 3 zones, including relevant supporting projects and infrastructure, should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with an offshore wind farm.	Not relevant
<b>Tidal Stream and Wave</b>	TIDE1	<p>In defined areas of identified tidal stream resource, proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they would not compromise potential future development of a tidal stream project</p> <p>b) how, if there are any adverse impacts on potential tidal stream deployment, they would minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.</p>	The English Offshore Scheme is located in an area that has no tidal or wave energy site agreements.	Not relevant
<b>Carbon Capture and Storage</b>	CCS1	Within defined areas of potential carbon dioxide storage, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:	The English Offshore Scheme is located in an area where a licence for carbon capture and storage has been granted. There are two CCS project that have been identified within the	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
		<p>a) that they would not prevent carbon dioxide storage</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on carbon dioxide storage, they would minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Project area in the Eastern Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan area: <b>Endurance CO2 Storage Facility and Pipelines</b> and <b>Viking CCS</b>. EGL 3 and EGL 4 overlap the proposed pipelines associated with the CCS facilities. The Viking CCS would utilise an existing pipeline.</p> <p>As with other pipeline crossings, agreements would be made with owners/operators to agree design and methods of crossings. This is standard practice and common place in the offshore environment.</p> <p>EGL 3 and EGL 4 would not prevent or have adverse effects on the CCS operations.</p>	
	CCS2	<p>Carbon Capture and Storage proposals should demonstrate that consideration has been given to the re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure rather than the installation of new infrastructure (either in depleted fields or in active fields via enhanced hydrocarbon recovery).</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with carbon capture and storage.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>
<b>Ports and Shipping</b>	PS1	<p>Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under-keel clearance should not be authorised in International Maritime Organization designated routes.</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme is not located in International Maritime Organization designation routes and do not include static sea surface infrastructure.</p> <p>Cable protection is not proposed in any areas where under keel clearance would be compromised.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
			The Navigation Risk Assessment provides a comprehensive assessment of this.	
	PS2	<p>Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure that encroaches upon important navigation routes should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) be compatible with the need to maintain space for safe navigation, avoiding adverse economic impact</li> <li>b) anticipate and provide for future safe navigational requirements where evidence and/or stakeholder input allows and</li> <li>c) account for impacts upon navigation in-combination with other existing and proposed activities.</li> </ul>	The English Offshore Scheme do not include static sea surface infrastructure.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	PS3	<p>Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) that they would not interfere with current activity and future opportunity for expansion of ports and harbours</li> <li>b) how, if the proposal may interfere with current activity and future opportunities for expansion, they would minimise this</li> <li>c) how, if the interference cannot be minimised, it would be mitigated</li> <li>d) the</li> </ul>	The English Offshore Scheme do not lie within the boundary of a statutory harbour authority area.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
		case for proceeding if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the interference.		
<b>Dredging and Disposal</b>	DD1	Proposals within or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas should demonstrate, in order of preference a) that they would not adversely impact dredging and disposal activities b) how, if there are adverse impacts on dredging and disposal, they would minimise these c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.	The English Offshore Scheme has been designed to avoid as many dredging and disposal sites as possible. There are 9 spoil disposal sites within proximity to the Project in the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan area. Only <b>Hornsea 1, HU205</b> remains open and is associated with the construction activities of the <b>Hornsea Offshore Wind Farms</b> but it is located 2.2 km from the Order Limits. Likely effects of these sites have been assessed in Chapter 25 (Other Offshore Users) and it has been concluded that the potential effects would not be significant.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
<b>Aggregates</b>	AGG1	Proposals in areas where a licence for extraction of aggregates has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.	Within the study area there are 6 aggregate extraction sites in the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan area. 5 sites are active, and 1 is for exploration. <b>Humber Overfalls Area 493</b> an active aggregate extraction site overlaps slightly with the Order Limits, however the route centreline would not enter the offshore aggregate site.  The likely effects on the aggregate extraction sites have been assessed in Chapter 25 Other offshore users as not significant as there are no direct effects on the extraction sites.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
	AGG2	Proposals within an area subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate should not be supported unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with aggregate extraction or there are exceptional circumstances.	There is one Exploration and Option area within the study area. <b>Area 1805</b> is located 2.5 km away from the Order Limits. Due to the distance there would be no impacts to the proposed exploration area.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	AGG3	<p>Within defined areas of high potential aggregate resource, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they would not, prevent aggregate extraction</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on aggregate extraction, they would minimise these</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the application if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.</p>	Within the study area there are no defined areas of high potential aggregate resource. The proposals would no effect or prevent aggregate extraction	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Cabling</b>	CAB1	Preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of installation is burial. Where burial is not achievable, decisions should take account of protection measures for the cable that may be proposed by the applicant.	The preferred method for EGL 3 and EGL 4 is to bury cables to ensure they are adequately protected. Only in areas where depth of burial is not achieved external cable protection (e.g., rock berm, concrete mattresses, rock bags etc) may be used.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
Fisheries	FISH1	<p>Within areas of fishing activity, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they would not prevent fishing activities on, or access to, fishing grounds</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on the ability to undertake fishing activities or access to fishing grounds, they would minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with their proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.</p>	<p>The Project is located within areas of fishing activity and temporary displacement may occur. Displacement may occur as construction progresses along the cable route.</p> <p>The Applicant would develop a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (an outline of which has been submitted with the PEIR) that sets out measures to promote the co-existence of commercial fishing and construction activities.</p> <p>The cables would be buried wherever possible, to enable fishing to continue post installation.</p>	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	FISH2	<p>Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they would not have an adverse impact upon spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts upon the spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat, they would minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with their proposals if it is not possible to</p>	<p>EGL 3 and EGL 4 are in spawning grounds and associated habitats for several pelagic and demersal species. The spatial extent of the English Offshore Scheme is limited, short-term duration and affects only a small proportion of total area. No significant, effects are predicted.</p>	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
		minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.		
<b>Aquaculture</b>	AQ1	<p>Within sustainable aquaculture development sites (identified through research), proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they would avoid adverse impacts on future aquaculture development by altering the seabed or water column in ways which would cause adverse impacts to aquaculture productivity or potential</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on aquaculture development, they can be minimised</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.</p>	The English Offshore Scheme are not within any existing or potential sustainable aquaculture development sites; there no significant adverse impacts are predicted.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Tourism and Recreation</b>	TR1	<p>Proposals for development should demonstrate that during construction and operation, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) they would not adversely impact tourism and recreation activities</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities, they would minimise them</p>	Recreational activities may occur within the study area including diving, water sports, recreational sailing and angling as well as bathing. There are seven designated Bathing Waters in the study area; consultation with the Environmental Agency confirmed that the entire coastline between Theddlethorpe and Anderby Creek is considered a bathing water. The impact the Project have had on tourism	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/Not Include in Assessment
		<p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.</p>	<p>and recreation has been assessed in the Other Offshore Users (Chapter 25).</p> <p>It was concluded that restrictions would be short term in nature and given the alternative locations available no significant impacts are anticipated. Once construction works are completed there would be no disruption to recreational users.</p>	
	TR2	<p>Proposals that require static objects in the East Marine Plan areas, should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they would not adversely impact on recreational boating routes</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on recreational boating routes, they would minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they would be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Whilst the English Offshore Scheme does include a static object (i.e., the cable) this would be buried in the seabed or protected. No impacts to recreational boating are therefore anticipated</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>
	TR3	<p>Proposals that deliver tourism and/or recreation related benefits in communities adjacent to the East Marine Plan areas should be supported.</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme does not have the potential to contribute to delivery of tourism and/or recreation related benefits.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment</p>

## 1.2.B.3 Northeast Inshore and Northeast Offshore Marine Plans

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
Infrastructure	NE-INF-1	Proposals for appropriate Offshore infrastructure which facilitates land-based activities, or land-based infrastructure which facilitates offshore activities (including the diversification or regeneration of sustainable offshore industries), should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme forms part of a 2-Gigawatt transmission reinforcement project that would transmit low carbon electricity from Scotland to England. It would improve the overall grid infrastructure but is not related to regeneration of sustainable offshore industries.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-INF-2	<p>(1) Proposals for alternative development at existing safeguarded landing facilities would not be supported.</p> <p>(2) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing safeguarded landing facilities must demonstrate that they avoid significant adverse impacts on existing safeguarded landing facilities.</p> <p>(3) Proposals for alternative development at existing landing facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) should not be supported unless that facility is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for waterborne transport.</p> <p>(4) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing landing facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) that may have significant adverse impacts on the landing facilities should demonstrate</p>	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with safeguarded landing facilities.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.		
<b>Co-existence</b>	NE-CO-1	Proposals that optimise the use of space and incorporate opportunities for co-existence and co-operation with existing activities would be supported.  Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on, or displace, existing activities must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	EGL 3 and EGL 4 are separate projects that are being developed jointly with co-location of infrastructure at the landfall.  The Applicant continues to engage with other third parties at the landfall.  The Applicant would also engage with fishermen and other offshore users. The Applicant would develop a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (an outline of which has been submitted with the Application) that sets out measures to promote the co-existence of commercial fishing and offshore wind farm development. A Navigational Risk Assessment would be implemented to minimise all potential impacts to acceptable or tolerable risk levels as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP).	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
<b>Aggregates</b>	NE-AGG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for extraction of aggregates has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the proposal is compatible with aggregate extraction.	Within the study area there are no aggregate extraction sites in the Northeast Marine plan areas.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-AGG-2	Proposals within an area subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate should not be	The English Offshore Scheme is not within an Exploration and Option agreement areas within the Northeast Marine Plan areas.	Not relevant – not included in

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		supported unless it is demonstrated that the proposal is compatible with aggregate extraction.		the assessment.
	NE-AGG-3	<p>Proposals in areas of high potential aggregate resource that may have significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction should demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	Within the English Offshore Scheme there are no defined areas of high potential aggregate resource; therefore, no significant adverse impacts are predicted.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Aquaculture</b>	NE-AQ-1	Proposals within existing or potential strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate consideration of and compatibility with sustainable aquaculture production. Where compatibility is not possible, proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:	The English Offshore Scheme is not within any existing or potential strategic area of sustainable aquaculture production.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>		
	NE-AQ-2	Proposals enabling the provision of infrastructure for sustainable aquaculture and related industries would be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with aquaculture.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Cables</b>	NE-CAB-1	<p>Preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of protection is burial.</p> <p>Where burial is not achievable, decisions should take account of protection measures for the cable that may be proposed by the applicant.</p> <p>Where burial or protection measures are not appropriate, proposals should state the case for proceeding without those measures.</p>	The preferred method for EGL 3 and EGL 4 is to bury cables to ensure they are adequately protected. Only in areas where depth of burial is not achieved external cable protection (e.g., rock berm, concrete mattresses, rock bags etc) may be used.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	NE-CAB-2	Proposals demonstrating compatibility with existing landfall sites and incorporating measures to enable development of future landfall opportunities should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme within the North -East Marine Plan area are not associated with existing landfall sites, activities are all located solely beyond 12 NM.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>Where this is not possible proposals would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts on existing and potential future landfall sites so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>		
	NE-CAB-3	<p>Where seeking to locate close to existing subsea cables, proposals should demonstrate compatibility with ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning activities relating to the cable.</p>	<p>The EGL 3 Project and EGL 4 Project within the Northeast Marine Plan areas are in a location where there are 6 existing subsea cables. All cross the Order Limits. Likely effects on these cables have been assessed in Chapter 25 (Other Offshore Users), and it has been concluded that whilst crossings would be required it is standard practice and common place, and significant impacts are not expected. Crossing agreements with third party owners would be sought and agreed.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>
<b>Dredging and Disposal</b>	NE-DD-1	<p>In areas of authorised dredging activity, including those subject to navigational dredging, proposals for other activities would not be supported unless they are compatible with the dredging activity.</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme are not associated with any authorised dredging activity and would not hinder any dredging works.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
	NE-DD-2	Proposals that cause significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites should not be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate the significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.	The English Offshore Scheme have been designed to avoid disposal sites where possible. There is 1 disposal site, Tyne Burial Site, TY193 within proximity to the Project in the Northeast Marine Plan area. It is 7.6 km from the Order Limits and is noted as closed.  Likely effects of these sites have been assessed in Chapter 25 (Other Offshore Users) and it has been concluded there would be no significant impacts.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	NE-DD-3	Proposals for the disposal of dredged material must demonstrate that they have been assessed against the waste hierarchy. Where there is the need to identify new dredge disposal sites, including for alternative use sites, proposals should be supported if they conform to best practice and guidance.	The pre-sweeping of sand waves is proposed within the draft Order Limits; disposal of material dredged as part of this activity would be disposed of within the draft Order Limits.  Consent is being sought through the DCO for this activity, appropriate sampling has been undertaken with agreement and in accordance with MMO guidance. The material to be deposited would be the same as the receiving environment and therefore no significant impacts are anticipated.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
<b>Oil and Gas</b>	NE-OG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for oil and gas has been granted or formally applied for should not be	There are 2 active pipelines that cross the draft Order Limits within the Northeast Marine Plan, <b>Ekofisk 2/4J to Teesside</b> and <b>Breagh 3IN</b>	Relevant but does not

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		authorised unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with the oil and gas activity.	<p><b>MEG pipeline – Part 1.</b> There are 8 oil and gas extant licensed blocks that cross the Order Limits through the Northeast Marine Plan areas.</p> <p>The works are of short duration, so no potential significant effects are predicted.</p>	hinder objectives.
	NE-OG-2	Proposals within areas of geological oil and gas extraction potential demonstrating compatibility with future extraction activity would be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme are not within an area where a license for new oil and gas extraction infrastructure has been granted or formally applied for.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Ports, Harbour and Shipping</b>	NE-PS-1	<p>In line with the National Policy Statement for Ports, sustainable port and harbour development should be supported.</p> <p>Only proposals demonstrating compatibility with current port and harbour activities would be supported.</p> <p>Proposals within statutory harbour authority areas or their approaches that detrimentally and materially affect safety of navigation, or the compliance by statutory harbour authorities with the Open Port Duty or the Port Marine Safety Code, would not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.</p>	The English Offshore Scheme are not associated with the port or harbour development and does not lie within the boundary of a statutory harbour authority area.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon future opportunity for sustainable expansion of port and harbour activities, must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>		
	NE-PS-2	<p>Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under keel clearance must not be authorised within or encroaching upon International Maritime Organization routing systems unless there are exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>The development does not include static sea surface infrastructure.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>
	NE-PS-3	<p>Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under keel clearance which encroaches upon high density navigation routes, strategically important navigation routes, or that pose a risk to the</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme does not include static sea surface infrastructure.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy Code</b>	<b>Policy Text</b>	<b>Assessment of Policy Plan</b>	<b>Include/ Not Include in Assessment</b>
		viability of passenger services, must not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.		
	NE-PS-4	Proposals promoting or facilitating sustainable coastal and/or short sea shipping as an alternative to road, rail or air transport would be supported where appropriate.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with coastal and/or short sea shipping.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Renewables</b>	NE-REN-1	Proposals that enable the provision of renewable energy technologies and associated supply chains, would be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme supports the transmission of electricity across the UK, which include energy generated from renewable technologies. The links provide electricity to areas of demand.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	NE-REN-2	Proposals for new activity within areas held under a lease or an agreement for lease for renewable energy generation should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the proposed development or activity would not reduce the ability to construct, operate or decommission the existing or planned energy generation project.	The English Offshore Scheme is not within an area for lease for renewable energy generation.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-REN-3	Proposals for the installation of infrastructure to generate offshore renewable energy, inside areas of identified potential and subject to relevant assessments, would be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme is not related to offshore renewable energy.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy Code</b>	<b>Policy Text</b>	<b>Assessment of Policy Plan</b>	<b>Include/ Not Include in Assessment</b>
<b>Heritage Assets</b>	NE-HER-1	<p>Proposals that demonstrate they would conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets would be supported.</p> <p>Where proposals may cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, proponents must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– any harm to the significance of heritage assets. If it is not possible to mitigate, then public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh the harm to the significance of heritage assets.</p>	<p>Potential impacts of the English Offshore Scheme on heritage assets are considered in a Marine Archaeological Technical Report in Chapter 26 – Marine Archaeology. The potential effects that the Proposed Works may have such as damage to/loss of archaeological material from direct/indirect impacts have all been found to have a minor or negligible impact. Known receptors would be avoided through the application of Archaeological Exclusion Zones, Temporary Archaeological Exclusion Zones (TAEZs) and subsequent micro-siting of infrastructure on the seabed, as necessary.</p> <p>All geophysical and geotechnical data collected has been assessed by an independent and accredited archaeologist to confirm the presence of archaeological features and proposed appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>A written Scheme of Investigation and a protocol for Archaeological Discoveries would be provided as part of the PEIR application.</p>	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
<b>Seascape and Landscape</b>	NE-SCP-1	<p>Proposals should ensure they are compatible with their surroundings and should not have a significant adverse impact on the character and visual resource of the seascape and landscape of the area.</p> <p>The location, scale and design of proposals should take account of the</p>	Once constructed no above sea surface structures would be visible	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>character, quality and distinctiveness of the seascape and landscape.</p>		
		<p>Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact on the seascape and landscape of the area should demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>		
		<p>If it is not possible to mitigate, the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh significant adverse impacts to the seascape and landscape of the area.</p>		
		<p>Proposals within or relatively close to nationally designated areas should have regard to the specific statutory purposes of the designated area. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>		

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
Fisheries	NE-FISH-1	Proposals that support a sustainable fishing industry, including the industry's diversification, should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme does not support or hinder the diversification of a sustainable fishing industry.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-FISH-2	<p>Proposals that enhance access for fishing activities should be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on access for fishing activities must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme is located within areas of fishing activity and temporary displacement may occur. Displacement may occur as construction progresses along the cable route.</p> <p>The Applicant would develop a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (an outline of which has been submitted with the PEIR) that sets out measures to promote the co-existence of commercial fishing and construction activities.</p> <p>The cables would be buried wherever possible, to enable fishing to continue post installation.</p>	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	NE-FISH-3	<p>Proposals that enhance essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory routes, should be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory</p>	EGL 3 and EGL 4 are in spawning grounds and associated habitats for several pelagic and demersal species. The spatial extent of the English Offshore Scheme is limited, short-term duration and affects only a small proportion of total area. No significant, effects are predicted.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>routes, must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>		
<b>Employment</b>	NE-EMP-1	<p>Proposals that result in a net increase in offshore related employment would be supported, particularly where they meet one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) are aligned with local skills strategies and support the skills available</li> <li>2) create a diversity of opportunities</li> <li>3) create employment in locations identified as the most deprived</li> <li>4) implement new technologies</li> </ul> <p>- in, and adjacent to, the northeast Marine Plan areas.</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme would seek to provide job opportunities to the local area where possible.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>
<b>Climate Change</b>	NE-CC-1	<p>Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration would be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on habitats that provide a flood defence or carbon sequestration ecosystem service must</p>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with conservation, restoration or enhancement of habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration ecosystem services.</p> <p>HDD or trenchless solution is being undertaken at the landfall to avoid any interaction with the dune system and flood defence.</p>	<p>Not relevant – does not hinder objectives.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>Ongoing consultation is taking place with the Environment Agency in respect to the beach nourishment works.</p>	
	NE-CC-2	<p>Proposals in the northeast Marine Plan areas should demonstrate for the lifetime of the Project that they are resilient to the impacts of climate change and coastal change.</p>	<p>Studies have been undertaken to ensure suitable burial depth so that the Proposed Works would not be impacted on by mobile sediments and therefore is resilient to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>
	NE-CC-3	<p>Proposals in the northeast Marine Plan areas, and adjacent Marine Plan areas, that are likely to have significant adverse impacts on coastal change, or on climate change adaptation measures inside and outside of the proposed Project, should only be supported if they can demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme would not have a significant adverse impact on coastal change or on climate change adaptation measures.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.		
<b>Carbon Capture Usage and Storage</b>	NE-CCUS-1	Decommissioning programmes for oil and gas facilities should demonstrate that they have considered the potential for re-use of infrastructure.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with any carbon capture usage and storage.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-CCUS-2	Carbon capture, usage and storage proposals incorporating the re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure would be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with any carbon capture usage and storage.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-CCUS-3	Proposals associated with the deployment of low carbon infrastructure for industrial clusters should be supported.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with any low carbon infrastructure.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Air Quality and Emissions</b>	NE-AIR-1	<p>Proposals must assess their direct and indirect impacts upon local air quality and emissions of greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Proposals that are likely to result in increased air pollution or increased emissions of greenhouse gases must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– air pollution and/or greenhouse gas emissions in line with current</p>	The primary source of greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the English Offshore Scheme is from construction vessels. Compliance of all project vessels with the regulations relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (the MARPOL Convention 73/78), with the aim of preventing and minimising pollution from ships. As assessment of this is provided in the PEIR.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		national and local air quality objectives and legal requirements.		
<b>Marine Litter</b>	NE-ML-1	Public authorities must make adequate provision for the prevention, re-use, recycling and disposal of waste to reduce and prevent marine litter.  Public authorities should aspire to undertake measures to remove marine litter within their jurisdiction.	A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which is the Project's commitment and management approach for environmental protection including waste management would be provided with the application. An outline CEMP is provided with the PEIR. The CEMP holds any contractors responsible to this commitment during pre-construction and construction phase of the English Offshore Scheme.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-ML-2	Proposals that facilitate waste re-use or recycling to reduce or remove marine litter would be supported.  Proposals that could potentially increase the amount of marine litter in the marine plan areas must include measures to, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – waste entering the marine environment.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with waste re-use or recycling to reduce or remove marine litter.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Water Quality</b>	NE-WQ-1	Proposals that protect, enhance and restore water quality would be supported.	An assessment of water quality has been provided as part of the coastal processes assessment. Some temporary increases in suspended sediment concentration may be	Relevant but does not hinder the

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Policy Code</b>	<b>Policy Text</b>	<b>Assessment of Policy Plan</b>	<b>Include/ Not Include in Assessment</b>
		Proposals that cause deterioration of water quality must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – deterioration of water quality in the marine environment.	anticipated as a result of the trenching and sandwave pre-sweeping. This would be a temporary effect and would have no lasting effect on water quality.	Project objectives.
<b>Access</b>	NEW-ACC-1	Proposals demonstrating appropriate enhanced and inclusive public access to and within the offshore area, including the provision of services for tourism and recreation activities, would be supported.  Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on public access should demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	During the construction phase there is the potential for recreational users to be displaced, or access restricted to their usual recreational areas and/or boat and shore-based angling activities. However, given the works in the northeast marine plan areas are all beyond 12 NM recreational activities are low and therefore no significant impacts to recreational users are anticipated.  Any disruption during the construction phase is anticipated to be temporary and localised. Once construction works are completed no restrictions would remain.	Relevant but does not hinder the Project objectives.
<b>Tourism and Recreation</b>	NE-TR-1	Proposals that promote or facilitate sustainable tourism and recreation activities, or that create appropriate opportunities to expand or diversify	The development is not associated with promotion of tourism or recreation.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>the current use of facilities, should be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>		
<b>Social Benefits</b>	NE-SOC-1	Those bringing forward proposals should consider and demonstrate how their development shall enhance public knowledge, understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the marine environment as part of (the design of) the proposal.	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with the enhancement of social benefits.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Defence</b>	NE-DEF-1	Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence areas should only be authorised with agreement from the Ministry of Defence.	The English Offshore Scheme is routed through a number of MoD Danger and Exercise area; effects would be temporary and short-term during construction of EGL 3 and EGL 4. The Applicant is engaging with the MoD.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
<b>Marine Protected Areas</b>	NE-MPA-1	Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine	Within the northeast marine plan area, the English Offshore Scheme overlaps slightly with the Southern North Sea SAC. In addition, EGL 4 lies adjacent to the <b>Northeast of Farnes</b>	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>protected area network would be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have adverse impacts on the objectives of marine protected areas must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse impacts, with due regard given to statutory advice on an ecologically coherent network.</p>	<p><b>Deep HPMA.</b> The Applicant has undertaken a Marine Conservation Zone Screening and Stage 1 Assessment which concluded that the conservation objectives would not be hindered by the English Offshore Scheme, this is provided with the PEIR. Additionally, a Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment would be provided with the final application.</p>	
	NE-MPA-2	<p>Proposals that enhance a marine protected area’s ability to adapt to climate change, enhancing the resilience of the marine protected area network, would be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have adverse impacts on an individual marine protected area’s ability to adapt to the effects of climate change, and so reduce the resilience of the marine protected area network, must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme would not hinder any marine protected areas’ ability to adapt to climate change.</p>	<p>Not relevant – not included in the assessment.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		– adverse impacts.		
	NE-MPA-3	Where statutory advice states that a marine protected area site condition is deteriorating or that features are moving or changing due to climate change, a suitable boundary change to ensure continued protection of the site and coherence of the overall network should be considered.	No such advice exists for the HPMA or Southern North Sea SAC.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
	NE-MPA-4	Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on designated geodiversity must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	The English Offshore Scheme would not have significant impacts on designated geodiversity.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.
<b>Biodiversity</b>	NE-BIO-1	Proposals that enhance the distribution of priority habitats and priority species would be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on the distribution of priority habitats and priority species must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with the enhancement of the distribution of priority habitats and priority species. Potential impacts of biodiversity are considered in the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA), Marine Conservation Assessment (MCZA) and Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment, these are provided in the PEIR. The likely impact is predicted to be moderately significant, however the mitigations in place would help to reduce	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant</li> </ul> </li> <li>d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.</li> </ul>	the potential impacts of the Proposed Works on biodiversity.	
	NE-BIO-2	<p>Proposals that enhance or facilitate native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, would be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may cause significant adverse impacts on native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– adverse impacts so they are no longer significant</li> </ul> </li> <li>d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.</li> </ul>	The English Offshore Scheme would not enhance or facilitate native species migration. Potential impacts of biodiversity are considered in the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA), Marine Conservation Assessment (MCZ) and Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment. The likely impact is predicted to be moderately significant, however the mitigations in place would help to reduce the potential impacts of the Proposed Works on biodiversity.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	NE-BIO-3	Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision	The English Offshore Scheme is not associated with any conservation, restoration or enhancement of coastal habitats.	Not relevant – not included in the assessment.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		of ecosystem services, would be supported.		
		<p>Proposals must take account of the space required for coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of ecosystem services, and demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> <li>d) compensate for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– net habitat loss.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Invasive Non-native Species</b>	NE-INNS-1	<p>Proposals that reduce the risk of introduction and/or spread of invasive non-native species should be supported.</p> <p>Proposals must put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse impacts that would arise through the introduction and transport of invasive non-native species, particularly when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) moving equipment, boats or livestock (for example fish or shellfish) from one water body to another</li> </ul>	<p>The English Offshore Scheme vessels, equipment, and external cable protection have the potential to introduce and/or spread invasive non-native species. All relevant guidelines would be followed including vessel cleaning facilities and the use of anti-fouling paint and contractors would comply with the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast water and Sediments. Additionally, a biosecurity risk assessment would be undertaken prior to the start of construction.</p>	<p>Relevant but does not hinder objectives.</p>

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		2) introducing structures suitable for settlement of invasive non-native species, or the spread of invasive non-native species known to exist in the area.		
	NE-INNS-2	Public authorities with functions to manage activities that could potentially introduce, transport or spread invasive non-native species should implement adequate biosecurity measures to avoid or minimise the risk of introducing, transporting or spreading invasive non-native species.	The English Offshore Scheme' vessels, equipment, and external cable protection have the potential to introduce and/or spread invasive non-native species. All relevant guidelines would be followed including vessel cleaning facilities and the use of anti-fouling paint and contractors would comply with the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast water and Sediments. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are predicted. Additionally, a biosecurity risk assessment would be undertaken prior to the start of construction.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
<b>Disturbance</b>	NE-DIST-1	Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on highly mobile species through disturbance or displacement must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	The English Offshore Scheme crosses the Southern North Sea SAC for a short distance within the Northeast marine plan areas. This SAC was designated due to the presence of a <i>Phocoena Phocoena</i> (harbour porpoise) population, which are highly mobile species. The Applicant has undertaken HRA screening and would provide a Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment with the final application. Additionally impacts to marine mammals are considered in Chapter 22, due to	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
			the short term and temporary disturbance no significant impacts are anticipated.	
<b>Underwater Noise</b>	NE-UWN-1	Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive sound must contribute data to the UK Marine Noise Registry as per any currently agreed requirements. Public authorities must take account of any currently agreed targets under the Marine Strategy Part One Descriptor 11.	Impulsive sounds associated include surveys. The Applicant to date has provided data to the Marine Noise Registry and would continue to do as and when further surveys are planned. No impulsive sounds are proposed as part of the cable installation works.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
	NE-UWN-2	Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive or non-impulsive noise must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate – adverse impacts on highly mobile species so they are no longer significant.  If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for the proceeding.	Construction activities involved in preparation and installation of the subsea cables generate underwater sound. The presence of vessels creates a continuous sound, whereas impulsive sounds are associated with surveys.  The Applicant has provided an assessment of underwater noise as part of the PEIR.  Only surveys deemed necessary to facilitate the installation of the cables would be undertaken and although subject to separate consent, the Applicant is prioritising low order disposal of UXO over high order.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.
<b>Cumulative Effects</b>	NE-CE-1	Proposals which may have adverse cumulative effects with other existing, authorised, or reasonably foreseeable	Potential cumulative impacts affecting the local ecosystem would be considered in the cumulative effects assessment which would be provided in the ES.	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Text	Assessment of Policy Plan	Include/ Not Include in Assessment
		<p>proposals must demonstrate that they would, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>– adverse cumulative and/or in-combination effects so they are no longer significant.</p>		
<b>Cross-border Co-operation</b>	NE-CBC-1	<p>Proposals must consider cross-border impacts throughout the lifetime of the proposed activity.</p> <p>Proposals that impact upon one or more marine plan areas or Onshore environments must show evidence of the relevant public authorities (including other countries) being consulted and responses considered.</p>	<p>The end-to-end projects are being considered as part of the EIA, assessments relative to other Marine Plan Areas are provided within this document above.</p> <p>Where appropriate transboundary impacts are also considered and would be presented within the ES.</p>	Relevant but does not hinder objectives.

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

Registered in England and Wales  
No. 4031152  
[nationalgrid.com](http://nationalgrid.com)