

## APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Table 0.1 Statutory Consultees

Consultee	Nature of Contact	Nature of Response	Where is this issue dealt with?
Cefas	Letters, phone, email and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commented that the proposed benthic survey methodology was appropriate.</li> <li>Made recommendations on the epifaunal and fish survey methodology.</li> <li>Scope of metocean survey was agreed with Cefas prior to the survey.</li> <li>Meeting with Cefas in which agreed updates to Metocean report.</li> <li>Cefas acknowledged that there is very little potential for cumulative impacts at the site.</li> <li>Noted the importance of taking into consideration the presence of <i>Sabellaria</i> sp.</li> <li>Cefas were contacted in order to obtain any available data or literature regarding herring nursery and spawning grounds.</li> </ul>	<p>Sections 8 and 11. Biological Baseline and Assessment</p> <p>Sections 7 and 10. Physical Baseline and Assessment.</p> <p>Appendix C1 - Baseline Study of Marine Ecology</p> <p>Appendix C2 - Sabellaria Report</p>
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	Responded at scoping stage, and email and letter correspondence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will have a major impact on helicopter operations in support of the Southern North Sea gas industry.</li> <li>Site lies beneath three helicopter main routes (HMRs) serving the southern North Sea offshore gas installations.</li> <li>Helicopters sometimes required to fly at low altitude.</li> <li>Presence of turbines would deny the use of routes.</li> <li>EIA will need to fully assess potential effects on civil aviation, in particular the HMRs.</li> </ul>	Section 9.6 and 12.6. Aviation Baseline and Assessment
Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (formerly DTI)	Letters, phone, email and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Consenting Authority under <i>Section 36 Electricity Act 1989</i>, regular meetings have been held with DBERR to discuss the proposed development.</li> </ul>	
Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS)	Responded at scoping stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfied that the collection of site-specific data will allow a full assessment of the possible impact of a wind farm on tourism and recreation.</li> <li>Future consultation should include Sport England and the National Federation of Sea Anglers.</li> </ul>	Section 9.9 and 12.9. Socio-Economic Baseline and Assessment
Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)	Responded at scoping stage and subsequently, letters, phone, email and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Consenting Authority under <i>FEPA</i> and <i>CPA</i>, regular meetings have been held with to discuss the proposed development.</li> <li>Suggest that scope of EIA is reviewed once it becomes clearer whether the consenting authority will be required to carry out an Appropriate Assessment.</li> <li>If an AA is required and adverse effects are shown, the consenting authority will need to satisfy itself that there are no alternative solutions before it can go on to consider whether overriding public interest applies.</li> <li>EIA needs to fully assess potential extension of existing SPA/SAC sites into offshore areas.</li> </ul>	Section 14. Habitats Regulations Assessment
Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions [now DfT and DCLG]	Comment from DfT at scoping stage.	Recommend that THLS and MCA are consulted. In offshore wind farm cases, interest of DfT will be covered in the final ES if EN and other consultees are consulted fully.	THLS, MCA and EN were consulted, see entries in this table

Consultee	Nature of Contact	Nature of Response	Where is this issue dealt with?
Department for Transport	Meeting July 2007	DfT were briefed on Humber Gateway project and Navigation Risk Assessment. Update was welcomed by DfT.	Section 9.10 and 12.10. Shipping and Navigation Baseline and Assessment.
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Letters, phone, email and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement over general development and its alignment with strategic priorities for the area, including socio-economic aspects and renewables development.</li> <li>Provided datasets on cliff erosion and beach profile</li> <li>Recommends a number of public exhibitions are held.</li> <li>Main impacts will be visual for those living on or visiting the coast, and traffic during construction.</li> <li>Benefits should be targeted across the region rather than just locally. These could include something innovative in terms of climate change, sustainability, and fuel poverty.</li> </ul>	Section 9.9 and 12.9. Socio-Economic Baseline and Assessment
English Heritage	Meeting June 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EH requested that they are briefed on all landfall issues and plans for coastal stabilisation, given the poor coastal stability of the region.</li> <li>Buffer zones around wrecks were agreed with EH. As more information has become available, these have been refined.</li> <li>Commented on proposed scope of WSI.</li> </ul>	Section 9.3 and 12.3. Marine Archaeology Baseline and Assessment  Appendix F2 (Written Scheme of Investigation)
Environment Agency	Meeting May 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raised concerns over the impact of Humber Gateway project on erosion of the Holderness Coast.</li> <li>Recommended that the potential for increased erosion rates and future coastal defences are considered.</li> </ul>	Sections 7 and 10. Physical Baseline and Assessment
Marine & Fisheries Agency	Letters, phone, email and in person	<p>Provided comments on baseline study of marine ecology, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommending further surveys.</li> <li>Recommending additional information be included in the baseline report.</li> <li>Recommended further statistical analysis</li> <li>Commended EON for undertaking a specific Sabellaria survey.</li> </ul> <p>As Consenting Authority under FEPA and CPA, regular meetings have been held with to discuss the proposed development.</p>	Sections 8 and 11. Biological Baseline and Assessment.  Appendix C1 - Baseline Study of Marine Ecology  Appendix C2 - Sabellaria Report

Consultee	Nature of Contact	Nature of Response	Where is this issue dealt with?
Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)	Meetings March 2005, February and September 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested that E.ON make reference to Kentish Flats radar trials in the Humber Gateway ES.</li> <li>Confirmed that 1 nm TSS buffer zone is appropriate.</li> <li>Commented that navigation risk assessment must comply with MGN 275 and DTI Guidance '<i>Methodology for assessing the marine navigational safety risks of offshore wind farms</i>'.</li> <li>Recommends that its template for Emergency Response and Co-operation Plans is used as part of the Active Safety Management System.</li> <li>Confirmed that MCA is satisfied with scope of AIS survey to verify existing baseline shipping and navigation. However, noted that further validation surveys may be required if the ES submission slips beyond summer 2007.</li> <li>Requested that reference be made to DTI vessel type database, as contained in the '<i>Methodology for assessing the marine navigational safety risks of offshore wind farms</i>'.</li> <li>Recommended installation of east cardinal mark (also recommended by ABP Humber).</li> <li>Noted that vessels may cut the corner of the wind farm site. ABP are to include a wind farm warning in their 2 hour broadcast and will proactively manage the situation.</li> <li>Noted that collision risk is higher at deep-water sites such as the Humber than at shallow water wind farm sites.</li> <li>The cumulative impact with Westernmost Rough is likely to be positive as vessels will be routed further out when the Westernmost Rough site is developed, therefore resolving the potential Humber Gateway corner-cutting issue.</li> <li>Requested information on decommissioning, cable depths, methods of trenching.</li> <li>Recommended a buoy system to identify the limits of the TSS buffer zone (Trinity House Lighthouse Service as the lead authority on this), and a guard ship for when construction vessels move within the boundary.</li> <li>Humber Coastguard attended hazard review workshop.</li> <li>Agreed scope of traffic survey and navigational risk assessment with Anatec.</li> <li>Based on survey data, proximity of wind farm to shipping using TSS was discussed, particularly in relation to potential radar effects and distances defined in MCA template.</li> <li>Layout options were presented to MCA, including TSS buffer. This was noted and approved.</li> </ul>	Section 9.10 and 12.10. Human Baseline and Assessment
Ministry of Defence (Defence Estates)	Letters, email, phone and in person	<p>The MoD has been consulted in the early process of the development, using the protocol agreed with the BWEA. This was to ensure that the site selected was appropriate and did not compromise the safeguarding activities of the MoD.</p> <p>The MoD responded in May 2004 and stated that it has no objection to the proposed Humber Gateway wind farm. However, should the proposal go ahead, the MoD wish to be informed of the date of commencement and completion of construction works, the height of the tallest structure, the maximum extension of construction equipment (e.g. cranes) and coordinates of the turbines and if the site will be lit. E.ON has subsequently written back to the MoD, requesting reconfirmation that it has no objection. The MoD has since requested further information about the project, which E.ON has provided. At the time of the assessment, a further response from the MoD was awaited.</p> <p>The MoD also provided information on activities at Donna Nook RAF training site.</p>	Section 9.6 and 12.6. Aviation Baseline and Assessment
Natural England (and previously English Nature)	Letters, email, phone and in person	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided information on data life of baseline surveys and gave recommendations on ways developers can validate their datasets.</li> <li>NE to provide guidance on future SPAs in the area.</li> <li>Advised on location of control site.</li> </ul>	Sections 8, 11 and 14. Biological Baseline, Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment

Consultee	Nature of Contact	Nature of Response	Where is this issue dealt with?
Natural England (and previously English Nature)	Letters, email, phone and in person	<p>Ornithology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advised on bird survey methodology.</li> <li>• Recommended that assessment takes into account Yorkshire Wildlife Trust's list of key species.</li> <li>• Commented on findings of bird surveys.</li> <li>• Recommended that methodology is revised to maximise opportunity for bird sightings.</li> <li>• Raised concerns over techniques to understand migration patterns; recommended improvements to methods.</li> <li>• Advised on collision risk assessment methodology.</li> <li>• Commented that Appropriate Assessment may be required for terns.</li> <li>• NE agreed to provide guidance on the potential SPA off Flamborough Head.</li> <li>• Raised concerns regarding linkages between fish and ornithology, given that many species are piscivorous.</li> <li>• Noted that displacement, disturbance, or barrier effects are unlikely to be significant.</li> </ul>	<p>Sections, 8.6, 11.6 and 14. Ornithology Baseline, Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment</p>
Natural England (and previously English Nature)	Letters, email, phone and in person	<p>Benthic Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressed concerns over potential impacts on <i>Sabellaria</i> population.</li> <li>• Commented that benthic habitat loss under the various turbine array options should be assessed.</li> <li>• Natural England and JNCC have identified a need to review and clarify the definitions of cobble reefs in future guidance.</li> <li>• Recommended further surveys in order to determine the functionality of <i>Sabellaria</i> colonies and the location of cobble habitats.</li> </ul>	<p>Sections 8 and 11. Biological Baseline and Assessment</p>
Natural England (and previously English Nature)	Letters, email, phone and in person	<p>Marine mammals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raised concerns over the impacts of noise on marine mammals.</li> <li>• Raised concerns over in-combination effects on seals at Donna Nook and recommended mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Advised that it would be conceivable to construct during the closed season without causing deliberate disturbance to seals.</li> <li>• Identified pupping and foraging female seals at Donna Nook as key piling noise receptors.</li> <li>• Raised concerns that construction mitigation does not consider the potential longer-term population level impacts of pile driving.</li> <li>• Advised on how best to conduct underwater baseline noise surveys.</li> <li>• Commented on acoustic modelling methods.</li> <li>• Advised that further marine mammal surveys prior ES submission were not necessary.</li> </ul>	<p>Sections 8.5 and 11.5. Marine Mammals Baseline and Assessment</p>

Consultee	Nature of Contact	Nature of Response	Where is this issue dealt with?
Royal Yachting Association	Position paper on offshore energy developments, telephone conference 17/04/2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity data for RYA Sharing the Wind and Coastal Atlas was reviewed and agreed to still be current.</li> <li>Raised concerns regarding collision risk, although noted that most sites can be made sufficiently safe.</li> <li>Recommended that an effective <i>Emergency Response System</i> should be developed to address safety issues.</li> <li>RYA supports guidance issued by Trinity House on marking and lighting issues and work with Trinity House to identify site specific issues that occur. Recommends that turbines are visible to both small craft and large ships.</li> <li>Recommend that developments account for the effect on small craft navigation and communication equipment.</li> <li>Raised concerns over communications impacts whereby big ships may fail to identify smaller craft. Noted that there TSS buffer zone would help this.</li> <li>Areas used by recreational craft must be accounted for when examining the impacts of wind farms.</li> <li>Raised concerns over interference with wind speed and/ or turbulence in racing areas.</li> <li>Recommended that the location of the site should not block off key channels or activity areas.</li> <li>Raised concerns over end of life of the site.</li> <li>RYA accepts need for safety zone during construction but not during operation unless supported by a site-specific risk assessment.</li> </ul>	Section 9.10 and 12.10 Shipping and Navigation Baseline and Assessment
Trinity House	Letters, email, phone and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raised concerns regarding marking and lighting of turbines.</li> <li>Raised concerns regarding future requirements of Humber Light Float.</li> <li>Requested that that consideration be given to arranging the turbines such that a straight boundary line is achieved, or as near as possible, which E.ON will address.</li> <li>Provided their preferred options for marking the site, for each layout option.</li> </ul>	Section 9.10 and 12.10 Human Baseline and Assessment
Trinity House (TH), Chamber of Shipping (CoS) and BERR	Letters, email, phone and in person. Meeting April 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TH raised possibility of synchronising the lighting on the different edges.</li> <li>TH raised issue of the position and types of markers and buoys required.</li> <li>CoS raised concerns over increased congestion and hence increased collision risk.</li> <li>It was felt that little impact would occur to voyage times or fuel consumption.</li> <li>TH and CoS raised concern over lone turbine in the SE corner of the 3.6 MW and the 5 MW layouts, and the layout of the eastern edge of the site which E.ON will address.</li> <li>TH and CoS believe that wind farm would render Humber Light Float redundant in its present location.</li> <li>TH to give consideration to location of a buoy off the northeast corner of site</li> </ul>	Section 9.10 and 12.10 Human Baseline and Assessment

**Table 0.2 Non Statutory Consultees**

Consultee	Nature of contact	Issues	Where dealt with in ES
ABP Humber	Letters, email, phone and in person. Includes in person (2004, 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer all ships to route themselves east of Humber Light Float as it provides better alignment for joining/ exiting TSS. Therefore view this as a positive effect of the wind farm.</li> <li>Based on survey data, proximity of wind farm to shipping using TSS was discussed.</li> <li>Layout options were presented to ABP, including TSS buffer. Confirmed that the proposed layouts and concept of design commitments are acceptable.</li> <li>ABP provided information on known developments in the Humber and VTS upgrade.</li> <li>Agreed scope for NRA.</li> <li>Attended hazard review workshop.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 13. Cumulative Assessment</p> <p>Section 9.10 and 12.10. Shipping and Navigation Baseline and Assessment</p>
British Wind Energy Association	20 September 2006 Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlighted importance of open communication with the fishing industry eg through regular newsletters</li> <li>Following the lead of the oil and gas sector and the cable laying industry, Kingfisher electronic maps should be updated to include wind farm developments.</li> </ul>	Section 9.5 and 12.5. Commercial Fisheries Baseline and Assessment
BP Exploration Ltd	Letters, email, phone and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided details of line of sight link in the area, and requested results of impact assessment on this link. BP to wait for ES submission.</li> </ul>	Sections 9.8 and 12.8. Line of sight link Baseline and Assessment
CEMEX UK Marine Ltd	Letters and email.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Main areas affected by proposed development are licence Area 102 and application Area 448.</li> <li>Main navigational issues relate to the danger to dredger, turbines and power cables in the event of a major control failure on board the dredger. Mitigation measures adopted at other wind farms were discussed.</li> <li>Buffer zones suggested between dredging areas and turbines</li> <li>Fewer issues of concern raised regarding navigation, although it was noted that the project will cause vessels to deviate from their current route and hence increase streaming times.</li> </ul>	Section 9.10 and 12.10. Shipping and Navigation Baseline and Assessment
CHC Scotia Helicopters	Letters, email, phone and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will have a major impact on helicopter operations in support of the Southern North Sea gas industry.</li> <li>Site lies beneath three helicopter main routes (HMRs) serving the southern North Sea offshore gas installations.</li> <li>Helicopters sometimes required to fly at low altitude.</li> <li>Presence of turbines would deny the use of routes.</li> <li>EIA will need to fully assess potential effects on civil aviation, in particular the HMRs.</li> </ul>	Section 9.6 and 12.6. Aviation Baseline and Assessment
Cruising Association (CA)	Meetings April 2007 and May 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged that the area is not busy with respect to recreational craft, and that the site will not cause significant problems.</li> <li>Advised on the location, timing and trends in the use of the area by recreational craft.</li> <li>Advised that recreational vessels in the area are fully equipped vessels crewed by competent crews.</li> <li>Sailing areas in Sharing the Wind are considered as being 'optimistic'.</li> <li>Recommends a buoy on NE side of site and fog horns to assist during poor</li> </ul>	Section 9.10 and 12.10. Shipping and Navigation Baseline and Assessment



Consultee	Nature of contact	Issues	Where dealt with in ES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visibility.</li> <li>Satisfied with separation distance to TSS</li> <li>The CA position is that 50 m operational safety zones are not necessary.</li> <li>Attended hazard review workshop.</li> </ul>	
Humberside Archaeological Partnership (HAP)	Response from DH Evans during scoping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that a large number of wrecks are likely to exist in the study area, suggested magnetometer/ sidescan sonar be used.</li> <li>Noted that high erosion rates of coast have resulted in extensive post-glacial buried landscapes being buried.</li> <li>Noted that direct impacts from turbines likely to be limited but cable routing may have impacts.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Section 9.3 and 12.3. Marine Archaeology Baseline and Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Appendix F2 (Written Scheme of Investigation)</i></p>
Humberside International Airport	Letters and email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will have a major impact on helicopter operations in support of the Southern North Sea gas industry.</li> <li>Site lies beneath three helicopter main routes (HMRs) serving the southern North Sea offshore gas installations.</li> <li>Helicopters sometimes required to fly at low altitude.</li> <li>Presence of turbines would deny the use of routes.</li> <li>EIA will need to fully assess potential effects on civil aviation, in particular the HMRs.</li> </ul>	<i>Section 9.6 and 12.6. Aviation Baseline and Assessment</i>
National Air Traffic Services (NATS) (En-route) Ltd	Email June 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Humber Gateway likely to have a negative impact on radar at Claxby in Lincolnshire. Hence it is likely that NATS would object to a planning application.</li> <li>Agreed to undertake an assessment of proposals in the Greater Wash area. Requested further information on development.</li> </ul>	<i>Section 9.6 and 12.6. Aviation Baseline and Assessment</i>
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations	Meeting March 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The fishery industry requires information regarding the extent of a possible exclusion zone around the Humber Gateway site.</li> <li>The NFFO asks that a dedicated field assessment using a full range of gears as used by the fishing industry be undertaken.</li> </ul>	<i>Sections 9.5 and 12.5. Commercial Fisheries Baseline and Assessment</i>
North East Sea Fisheries Committee		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussions have taken place between the NFSA and the Humber Gateway Fisheries Liaison Officer.</li> </ul>	<i>Sections 9.5 and 12.5. Commercial Fisheries Baseline and Assessment</i>
National Federation of Sea Anglers (NFSA)	Letters, phone and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussions have taken place between the NFSA and the Humber Gateway Fisheries Liaison Officer.</li> </ul>	<i>Sections 9.5 and 12.5. Commercial Fisheries Baseline and Assessment</i>
Royal National Lifeboat Institute (RNLI)	Meeting May 2007	RNLI Humber Coxwain Superintendent attended hazard review workshop.	<i>Section 9.10 and 12.10. Shipping and Navigation Baseline and Assessment</i>
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Meeting July 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raised concerns in relation to migratory bird flight lines, lighting and sediment transport.</li> <li>Highlighted the potential need for an Appropriate Assessment, potential effects on future SAC/SPAs should also be assessed.</li> <li>Noted the importance of cumulative assessment.</li> <li>Requested that scope and methodologies of bird surveys be discussed with RSPB. Requested two years baseline data, including boat/ aerial surveys and potentially radar.</li> <li>Recommended that the assessment take account of collision risk, disturbance, displacement and barrier effects.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Sections, 8.6, 11.6 and 14. Ornithology Baseline, Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Section 14 Habitats Regulations Assessment</i></p>

Consultee	Nature of contact	Issues	Where dealt with in ES
Statoil (Langerled) Project	Response during scoping, information from Metoc re: pipeline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Felt that scoping report was comprehensive.</li> <li>Noted that EIA needs to consider in-combination effects with Statoil pipelines.</li> <li>Information from Metoc was used to consider in-combination effects.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 9.7 and 12.9 Other Infrastructure Baseline and Assessment</p> <p>Section 13 Cumulative assessment</p>
StenaLine	12 August 2004 Memo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>StenaLine specified the routes that they operate under different tide and swell conditions.</li> <li>The effects of Triton Knoll and Dungeon East wind farms on these routes were highlighted, including the necessity for traffic re-routing and predicted effects on fuel consumption.</li> <li>No reference was made to the impacts of Humber Gateway on these shipping routes.</li> </ul>	Section 9.10 and 12.10. Shipping and Navigation Baseline and Assessment
The Wildlife Trusts	Meetings, Letters, email, phone and in person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raised concern that sediment transport patterns were not interrupted.</li> <li>Provided information on bird populations, behaviour, movement and collisions in the area.</li> <li>Raised concern about differences between numbers of manx shearwaters and grey goose reported in Humber Gateway survey and YWR records.</li> <li>Recommended that data from Spurn Observatory is used.</li> <li>Noted that radar testing at Spurn has showed that the Humber is a flyway for birds.</li> <li>Acknowledged that focus of assessment is on species of importance to the SPA,, as agreed with NE. However, YWT raised concerns about other species, such as blackbirds.</li> <li>Noted that findings from offshore surveys for birds such as auks (ie those less affected by adverse weather conditions) tied in well with observations on the shore.</li> <li>Expressed a preference for a layout with fewer larger turbines.</li> <li>Indicated that YWT unlikely to object to scheme unless there was some outstanding impact. Would still make strong comments on the proposals were necessary and keen to strengthen the scheme.</li> <li>Noted that lights offshore can attract birds.</li> <li>Key issues for YWT are: effects on birds, correlation with onshore and offshore survey data, effects on marine species, effects on feeding for birds from Flamborough Head and sediment supply.</li> <li>Noted opportunities to promote sustainable energy and encourage nature-based tourism as a result of the wind farm.</li> <li>Pleased that assessment will include species outside Natura 2000 and other designated areas, and effects on passerines.</li> </ul>	Sections, 8.6, 11.6 and 14. Ornithology Baseline, Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment
Yorkshire Forward	In Person	Engagement over approach to development and contribution development can make to region, particularly in socio-economic terms, sustainability and renewables profile.	Sections 9.9 and 12.9 Social and Economic Baseline and Assessment
WWF	Consultation during the scoping	Requested that EIA takes into consideration the WWF paper Wind Farm Development and Nature Conservation prepared (WWF, EN, RSPB and BWEA).	Sections 8 and 11 Biological Baseline and Assessment