



# Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extensions

Preliminary Environmental Information Report

**Volume 1**

Chapter 31 - Transboundary

April 2021

Title:	
<b>Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extensions Preliminary Environmental Information Report Chapter 31 Transboundary Impacts Summary</b>	
Document no.: PB8164-RHD-ZZ-XX-RP-Z-0010	
Date:	Classification
29 <sup>th</sup> April 2021	<b>Final</b>
Prepared by:	
<b>Royal HaskoningDHV</b>	
Approved by:	Date:
<b>Magnus Eriksen, Equinor</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> April 2021

## Table of Contents

<b>31</b>	<b>TRANSBOUNDARY IMPACTS SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>7</b>
31.1	Introduction .....	7
31.2	Policy, Legislation and Guidance .....	7
31.3	Consultation .....	8
31.4	Assessment Methodology .....	9
31.5	Transboundary Impact Assessment Scoping Outcomes.....	9
31.6	Offshore Transboundary Impact Assessment Summary.....	11
31.7	Onshore Transboundary Impact Assessment Summary.....	16
31.8	Wider Scheme Aspects Transboundary Impact Assessment Summary .....	16
31.9	Summary.....	17
31.10	References.....	17

## List of Tables

Table 31-1: NPS Assessment Requirements.....	8
Table 31-2: Transboundary impact assessment scoping outcomes .....	10
Table 31-3: Other countries considered in the marine mammal assessments through the relevant MU reference populations .....	11

## Glossary of Acronyms

DCO	Development Consent Order
DEP	Dudgeon Extension Project
EEA	European Economic Area
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
EU	European Union
ETG	Expert Topic Groups
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
MU	Management Units
NPS	National Policy Statements
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
SEANSE	Strategic Environmental Assessment North Seas Energy
SEP	Sheringham Shoal Extension Project
UK	United Kingdom
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System

## Glossary of Terms

The Applicant	Equinor New Energy Limited
Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension site	The Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension offshore wind farm boundary.
The Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP)	The Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension site as well as all onshore and offshore infrastructure.
European site	Sites designated for nature conservation under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive. This includes candidate Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Community Importance, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas, and is defined in regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
Onshore cable corridor	The area between the landfall and the onshore substation sites, within which the onshore cable circuits will be installed along with other temporary works for construction.

<p>Onshore Substation sites</p>	<p>Parcels of land within onshore substation zones A and B, identified as the most suitable location for development of the onshore substation. Two sites have been identified for further assessment within the PEIR.</p>
<p>Onshore Substation Zone</p>	<p>Parcels of land within the wider onshore substation search area identified as suitable for development of the onshore substation. Two substation zones (A and B) have been identified as having the greatest potential to accommodate the onshore substation.</p>
<p>Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension site</p>	<p>Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension offshore wind farm boundary.</p>
<p>The Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (SEP)</p>	<p>The Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension site as well as all onshore and offshore infrastructure.</p>

## 31 TRANSBOUNDARY IMPACTS SUMMARY

### 31.1 Introduction

1. This chapter of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) provides a summary of the potential transboundary impacts of the proposed Dudgeon Extension Offshore Wind Farm Project (DEP) and Sheringham Shoal Extension Offshore Wind Farm Project (SEP). It demonstrates how consideration has been made of transboundary impacts as required by The Espoo Convention, as implemented by the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive and transposed into UK law by way of the EIA Regulations.
2. This chapter draws information from and should be read in conjunction with:
  - **Chapter 11 Fish and Shellfish Ecology;**
  - **Chapter 12 Marine Mammal Ecology;**
  - **Chapter 13 Offshore Ornithology;**
  - **Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries;**
  - **Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation;**
  - **Chapter 16 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage;**
  - **Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology;**
  - **Chapter 23 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage;** and
  - **Chapter 27 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment.**

### 31.2 Policy, Legislation and Guidance

3. There are numerous items of legislation, guidance and policy applicable to transboundary impacts. The following sections provide detail on key pieces of international and UK legislation, policy and guidance which are relevant to this chapter.

#### 31.2.1 Legislation

4. Schedule 4 paragraph 5 of the 2017 EIA Regulations (abridged below) states the need for:
 

*“The description of the likely significant effects on the factors specified in regulation 4(2) should cover the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, transboundary, short-term, medium-term and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the development.”*
5. In line with this requirement, a description of likely significant transboundary effects is provided in each technical chapter of the PEIR and summarised in this chapter.
6. The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (referred to as the Espoo Convention) requires that assessments are extended across borders between Parties of the Convention when a planned activity may cause significant adverse transboundary impacts.

7. Regulation 32 of the EIA regulations sets out procedures to address issues associated with a development that might have a significant impact on the environment in European Member States. The procedures involve providing information to the Member State and for the Planning Inspectorate to enter into consultation with that State regarding the significant impacts of the development and the associated mitigation measures. Further advice on transboundary issues, in particular with regard to timing, process and consultation is given in the Planning Inspectorate (2018) Advice Note Twelve.

### 31.2.2 Guidance

8. Guidance that is applicable to a specific assessment is identified in the relevant chapters of this PEIR, as identified in [Section 31.1](#).

### 31.2.3 Policy

9. The specific requirements of the National Policy Statements (NPS) in relation to the transboundary impact assessment, relevant to DEP and SEP, are summarised in [Table 31-1](#).

Table 31-1: NPS assessment requirements

NPS Requirement	NPS Reference	Section Reference
<b>EN-3 – NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure</b>		
In some circumstances, transboundary issues may be a consideration as fishermen from other countries may fish in waters within which offshore windfarms are sited.	EN-3, paragraph 2.6.124	<a href="#">Section 31.6.4 &amp; Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries</a>
In some circumstances, vessels from other countries may sail in waters within which offshore wind farms are sited.	EN-3, paragraph 2.6.152	<a href="#">Section 31.6.5 &amp; Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation</a>

## 31.3 Consultation

10. To date, consultation specifically regarding the approach to transboundary impacts has been conducted through a number of Expert Topic Groups (ETG) as part of the Evidence Plan Process (EPP), through targeted consultation with particular stakeholders not engaged through the EPP and through the submission of the Scoping Report (RHDHV, 2019). Further details of the DEP and SEP consultation process are presented in [Chapter 7 Technical Consultation](#).



11. Under the Espoo Convention (1991), where a development is likely to cause 'significant adverse transboundary impact', relevant European Economic Area (EEA) Member States should be notified as early as possible, giving them the opportunity to participate in relevant EIA procedures. Following the request for a Scoping Opinion for DEP and SEP, the Planning Inspectorate issued a Transboundary Impacts Screening in January 2020 (First Transboundary Screening; PINS, 2020), in accordance with Regulation 32 of the 2017 EIA Regulations (further details in **Section 31.5** below). It is noted that the Secretary of State's duty under Regulation 32 of the 2017 EIA Regulations continues throughout the pre-application process and this chapter will be updated with the outcomes of any further transboundary related consultation and assessment and reported in the final Environmental Statement alongside the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
12. Further to this, in August 2020, the Applicant invited stakeholders from Belgium, France and the Netherlands to comment on the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report (RHDHV, 2020). Only the Netherlands responded, stating that they had no comments on the document.
13. In addition to the pre-application consultation, it is expected that further statutory transboundary consultation will be undertaken by the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with Regulation 32 of the EIA Regulations, if and when it accepts the DCO application for examination.

### 31.4 Assessment Methodology

14. As discussed in **Section 31.3**, transboundary stakeholders were invited to notify the Planning Inspectorate if they wished to be consulted on the proposed development.
15. The scope of the transboundary impact assessment (in terms of relevant issues and projects) has been established with consultees as the EIA has progressed, this is also detailed in **Chapter 6 EIA Methodology** and in each technical chapter.
16. Potential transboundary impacts have been considered as an integral part of the wider EIA process, with a clear audit trail provided to demonstrate why any potential effects on other EEA member states have been screened in or out for further assessment. The transboundary assessment methodology is therefore an extension of that applied to the wider EIA process, as explained in detail in each topic chapter where relevant. This has involved consideration of, for example, the sensitivity of transboundary receptors (i.e. are receptors sensitive to the effect in question) and the range of potential effects (i.e. is the zone of influence/range of effect large enough to be likely to affect sensitive transboundary receptors).

### 31.5 Transboundary Impact Assessment Scoping Outcomes

17. Transboundary impacts were scoped out in the Scoping Opinion (PINS, 2019) for a number of topics as detailed in **Table 31-2**. Only those topics that remained scoped in have been taken forward in the EIA process, with the draft assessment outcomes summarised in **Section 31.6** (offshore topics), **Section 31.7** (onshore topics) and **Section 31.8** (wider scheme aspects).

18. In addition, the 'First Transboundary Screening' undertaken by PINS on receipt of the scoping report (PINS, 2020) identified the Netherlands and Belgium for transboundary issues notification under Regulation 32, due to impacts on commercial fisheries. It is understood that only Belgium (Directorate-General Environment) responded to this and confirmed their intention to participate in the consultation process with regard to transboundary impacts (email response to PINS dated 24<sup>th</sup> January 2020).

*Table 31-2: Transboundary impact assessment scoping opinion outcomes*

Topic	Scoping outcome (PINS, 2019)
Chapter 8 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes	Scoped out
Chapter 9 Marine Water and Sediment Quality	Scoped out
Chapter 10 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology	Scoped out
Chapter 11 Fish and Shellfish Ecology	Scoped in
Chapter 12 Marine Mammal Ecology	Scoped in
Chapter 13 Offshore Ornithology	Scoped in
Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries	Scoped in
Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation	Scoped in
Chapter 16 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Scoped in
Chapter 17 Aviation and Radar	Scoped out
Chapter 18 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users	Scoped out
Chapter 19 Onshore Ground Conditions and Contamination	Scoped out
Chapter 20 Water Resources and Flood Risk	Scoped out
Chapter 21 Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation	Scoped out
Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology	Scoped in
Chapter 23 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Scoped in
Chapter 24 Air Quality	Scoped out
Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration	Scoped out
Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport	Scoped out
Chapter 27 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment	Scoped in
Chapter 28 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	Scoped out
Chapter 29 Socio-Economics and Tourism	Scoped out
Chapter 30 Health	Scoped out

## 31.6 Offshore Transboundary Impact Assessment Summary

19. This section presents a summary of the potential impacts on offshore transboundary receptors, where they are scoped in.

### 31.6.1 Fish and Shellfish Ecology

20. The distribution of the populations of fish and shellfish species assessed are independent of national geographical boundaries. The assessment for DEP and SEP has been undertaken taking into account the distribution of fish stocks and populations irrespective of national jurisdictions. Regardless, the assessments have demonstrated that the spatial extent of impacts from the construction, operation and decommissioning of DEP and SEP do not stretch beyond UK waters. As such, no transboundary impacts are anticipated with respect to fish and shellfish ecology.

### 31.6.2 Marine Mammal Ecology

21. The highly mobile nature of the marine mammal species considered in the assessment means that there is the potential for transboundary impacts. This has been taken into account throughout the assessment, as the study area for each species is based on their relevant Management Units (MU) (or area within which the same individuals are considered to be part of one larger overall population). The MUs (and therefore reference populations) for each species cover an area that is wider than the UK (**Table 31-3**). This approach has been taken through all of the marine mammal assessments.

*Table 31-3: Other countries considered in the marine mammal assessments through the relevant MU reference populations*

Country	Marine mammal species	Inclusion within assessments
Netherlands	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	White-beaked dolphin and minke whale	Part of the Celtic and Greater North Seas MU for both white-beaked dolphin and minke whale.
	Bottlenose dolphin	Part of the Greater North Sea and Coastal East Scotland MU for bottlenose dolphin.
	Grey seal and harbour seal	Part of the reference population area (Wadden Sea region) for both grey seal and harbour seal.
Germany	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	White-beaked dolphin and minke whale	Part of the Celtic and Greater North Seas MU for both white-beaked dolphin and minke whale.
	Bottlenose dolphin	Part of the Greater North Sea and Coastal East Scotland MU for bottlenose dolphin.

Country	Marine mammal species	Inclusion within assessments
	Grey seal and harbour seal	Part of the reference population area (Wadden Sea region) for both grey seal and harbour seal.
France	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	White-beaked dolphin and minke whale	Part of the Celtic and Greater North Seas MU for both white-beaked dolphin and minke whale.
	Bottlenose dolphin	Part of the Greater North Sea and Coastal East Scotland MU for bottlenose dolphin.
	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	Grey seal and harbour seal	Not part of the grey seal and harbour seal reference population area, and therefore no potential for transboundary impacts.
Belgium	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	White-beaked dolphin and minke whale	Part of the Celtic and Greater North Seas MU for both white-beaked dolphin and minke whale.
	Bottlenose dolphin	Part of the Greater North Sea and Coastal East Scotland MU for bottlenose dolphin.
	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	Grey seal and harbour seal	Not part of the grey seal and harbour seal reference population area, and therefore no potential for transboundary impacts.
Denmark	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	White-beaked dolphin and minke whale	Part of the Celtic and Greater North Seas MU for both white-beaked dolphin and minke whale.
	Bottlenose dolphin	Part of the Greater North Sea and Coastal East Scotland MU for bottlenose dolphin.
	Grey seal and harbour seal	Part of the reference population area (Wadden Sea region) for both grey seal and harbour seal.
Sweden	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	White-beaked dolphin and minke whale	Part of the Celtic and Greater North Seas MU for both white-beaked dolphin and minke whale.

Country	Marine mammal species	Inclusion within assessments
	Bottlenose dolphin	Part of the Greater North Sea and Coastal East Scotland MU for bottlenose dolphin.
	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	Grey seal and harbour seal	Not part of the grey seal and harbour seal reference population area, and therefore no potential for transboundary impacts.
Norway	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	White-beaked dolphin and minke whale	Part of the Celtic and Greater North Seas MU for both white-beaked dolphin and minke whale.
	Bottlenose dolphin	Part of the Greater North Sea and Coastal East Scotland MU for bottlenose dolphin.
	Harbour porpoise	Part of the North Sea MU for harbour porpoise.
	Grey seal and harbour seal	Not part of the grey seal and harbour seal reference population area, and therefore no potential for transboundary impacts.

22. There is a significant level of marine development being undertaken, and being planned, by other countries (including Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark) in the southern North Sea. Each of these countries have their own independent environmental assessment requirements and controls. As noted above, marine mammals are highly mobile, therefore there is the potential for transboundary impacts, especially with regard to underwater noise. However, these transboundary impacts are considered as an integral part of the marine mammals assessment, as the impacts for all species are based on the relevant MUs and reference populations.
23. Where there is potential for DEP and SEP to impact marine mammals from designated sites in other countries, this is assessed in the [draft Information for HRA Report](#) submitted alongside the PEIR.

### 31.6.3 Offshore Ornithology

24. The highly mobile nature of many of the bird species considered in the assessment means that there is the potential for transboundary impacts, either in a cumulative sense (i.e. cumulative impacts on the same receptors between DEP and SEP and other projects in other countries) or through impacts on species which are features of designated sites in other countries.
25. With respect to cumulative transboundary impacts, collisions and displacement at OWFs located outside UK territorial waters will occur, potentially increasing the total level of cumulative impact. A limited attempt at quantifying this has recently been made as part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment North Seas Energy (SEANSE) project. Whilst a useful indicator of the level of potential impacts on offshore ornithology receptors beyond UK waters, there are a range of limitations that make the approach unsuitable for impact assessment purposes in its current form.

26. In all cases, the spatial scale and size of seabird reference populations for a transboundary assessment is much larger, although the information is not presently available to enable a detailed quantitative assessment. However, due to the increased size of the relevant reference populations, it is anticipated that the inclusion of non-UK OWFs is highly likely to reduce the overall cumulative impact assessed for each species.
27. Where there is potential for DEP and SEP to impact birds that are features of designated sites in other countries, this is assessed in the **draft Information for HRA Report** submitted alongside the PEIR.

#### 31.6.4 Commercial Fisheries

28. The commercial fisheries chapter (**Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries**) has assessed the potential impacts on non-UK registered vessels operating within UK waters. This includes the potential effects on Belgian, Danish, Dutch and French commercial fishing fleets across all impact categories assessed, including exclusion from DEP and SEP and displacement effects. Transboundary impacts within UK waters have therefore been considered as an intrinsic part of the commercial fisheries EIA process, as presented in **Chapter 14**.
29. Transboundary impacts outside UK waters are limited to potential displacement of fishing effort from DEP and SEP into non-UK EEZs, namely the Dutch Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). However, based on the established fishing grounds targeted by the fleets under assessment it is not anticipated that displacement effects into the Dutch EEZ would be significant.
30. The 'First Transboundary Screening' undertaken by PINS on receipt of the scoping report (PINS, 2020) also identified Belgium in relation to potential commercial fisheries impacts. Landings by Belgian registered vessels for International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) rectangles 34F1 and 35F1 which contain DEP and SEP are primarily plaice and sole and these were the only species landed in quantities over 2 tonnes between 2012 and 2016. Since a peak in 2013, landings for both plaice and sole have fallen. The landings for each species from these areas at the end of 2016 represented only 0.014% of the total Belgian quota for plaice and 0.015% of the total quota for sole. Beam trawling activity by European Union (EU) registered vessels is concentrated to the east of the project areas, with the value of landings much higher from ICES rectangles 35F2 and 34F2, and to a lesser extent to the southwest in the area around The Wash. Based on Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data in 2017 no landings were made by EU beam trawlers within the DEP and SEP areas. Therefore the DEP and SEP project areas are not considered to be an important fishing area for Belgian registered vessels. Most of the impacts of DEP and SEP on Belgian fishing vessels are assessed as negligible during construction, operation and decommissioning. There may be minor adverse impacts on mobile fishing fleets as a whole (including Belgian vessels) due to displacement from the wind farm site leading to gear conflict and increased pressure on adjacent grounds, and due to the potential for gear snagging on cable surface protection. However, given how little fishing effort there is in DEP and SEP by Belgian vessels it is likely that these impacts are negligible.



### 31.6.5 Shipping and Navigation

31. Given the international nature of shipping and navigation, as identified in **Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation**, transboundary effects are possible. These are assessed in terms of impacts to international shipping routes. This includes effects on main routes with destinations at European ports such as Rotterdam (Netherlands) and Zeebrugge (Belgium).
32. Considering DEP in isolation three main routes with a European destination would be deviated (Tees (UK) / Rotterdam (Netherlands) and two Humber (UK) / Rotterdam (Netherlands) routes), with a maximum change of 4%. SEP in isolation would cause deviation to two main routes (Hull (UK) / Zeebrugge (Belgium) and Hull (UK) / Rotterdam (Netherlands)) by 0.1%.
33. Considering DEP and SEP together, while the total number of transboundary routes affected would increase the change in distance to the routes would remain as per the sites in isolation.
34. EU member states will be included in all formal stages of consultation and it is also noted that the deviations highlighted above have been raised by one operator, P&O, who highlight the increased distance and fuel costs associated with the deviations.
35. As per the operational impacts on main routes, transboundary effects are expected at a medium frequency given the usage of the study area by commercial vessels, and a low consequence given the minimal deviations that would be required and the embedded mitigation which will be in place to manage operational activities (details in **Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation**). The transboundary impact has therefore been assessed as minor adverse significance in EIA terms, both for DEP and SEP in isolation and together.

### 31.6.6 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

36. The North Sea is not the property of any nation, although distinctions are made between territorial waters (the administrative and political division which form part of a particular nations territory up to 12 nautical miles) and EEZs, which represent sea zones prescribed by the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Law of the Sea over which a state has special rights regarding the exploration and use of marine sources. Although DEP and SEP are within the UK's EEZ, any data acquired and archaeologically assessed as part of the Project also has the potential to feed into wider research objectives initiated by neighbouring EEZs in the North Sea (most notably, the Dutch and Belgian EEZs).
37. In terms of palaeolandscapes, Doggerland was a landscape of central importance in northern Europe, larger than many current European countries, and boasting a wealth of unexplored archaeology and environmental data vital to our understanding of how past populations met challenges of climate change and sea-level rise. With regard to maritime and aviation archaeology, the North Sea has played host to numerous conflicts, migration and trade routes and wrecks and aircraft from multiple nations are known to be present on the seafloor. Therefore, impacts are not restricted to the UK's EEZ and transboundary effects must be considered.

38. As in the UK, there are a number of research agendas and initiatives focusing on the archaeology of the North Sea from various European states and partnerships. For example, palaeolandscape research in the southern North Sea and the English Channel has been undertaken by the Flanders Marine Institute (platform for marine research), in partnership with the Ghent University, the Royal Institute for Natural Sciences (RBINS), the Natural History Museum of Rotterdam (the Netherlands) and the University of Bradford (UK) (<http://www.vliz.be/en/palaeolandscape-research>). In the Netherlands, the Cultural Heritage Agency, in conjunction with Rijkswaterstaat (the Dutch maritime and marine management organisation), has commissioned the production of a policy advice map for the North Sea's submerged archaeological landscapes. Much of this European wide research and policy has been brought together in in the Coastal Research Library publication Under the Sea: Archaeology and Palaeolandscapes of the Continental Shelf.
39. The potential for integrated research and management represents a positive cumulative, transboundary impact of development-led initiatives across all sectors of the North Sea. Alongside data produced through UK offshore wind farm development, and that of other European nations bordering the North Sea, data sharing across national boundaries has the potential to result in a significant beneficial impact. Should the proposed projects be granted consent, the approach to delivering these transboundary objectives will be established in consultation with key stakeholders post-consent, so that the potential beneficial effects can be realised by those engaged in marine archaeological research (and the offshore wind farm industry) for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.

### 31.7 Onshore Transboundary Impact Assessment Summary

40. This section presents a summary of the potential impacts on onshore transboundary receptors, where they are scoped in.

#### 31.7.1 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology

41. The potential for transboundary impacts in relation to onshore ecology and ornithology was initially identified in the Scoping Report (RHDHV, 2019). However, upon further review as part of the preparation of draft impact assessment (PEIR [Chapter 22](#)), since there is no international border near DEP and SEP and no pathway for impacts to occur, transboundary impacts have been scoped out of the assessment and have not been considered further.

#### 31.7.2 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

42. The potential for transboundary impacts in relation to onshore archaeology and cultural heritage was initially identified in the Scoping Report (RHDHV, 2019). However, upon further review as part of the preparation of draft impact assessment (PEIR [Chapter 23](#)), since there is no international border near DEP and SEP and no pathway for impacts to occur, transboundary impacts have been scoped out of the assessment and have not been considered further.

### 31.8 Wider Scheme Aspects Transboundary Impact Assessment Summary

43. This section presents a summary of the potential impacts on transboundary receptors for wider scheme aspects, where they are scoped in.



### 31.8.1 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment

44. Transboundary impacts were initially scoped into the seascape and visual impact assessment (SVIA), prior to detailed assessment being undertaken (RHDHV, 2019). However, based on the draft assessment that has now been completed, as presented in **Chapter 27 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment**, transboundary effects have now been scoped out of the SVIA since the coastlines of other EU members states fall outside of the 50km study areas and would have no visibility of the construction, operation or decommissioning phases of the wind farm sites. As such no transboundary effects will arise as a consequence of DEP and SEP.

### 31.9 Summary

45. This chapter of the PEIR provides a summary of the transboundary impact assessment for DEP and SEP. The EIA scoping process confirmed which topics had the potential for transboundary impacts to arise, with only those topics being taken forward for further consideration. The draft assessment outcomes are provided in the relevant topic chapters of the PEIR.
46. In all cases transboundary impacts have been considered as an intrinsic part of the wider EIA and HRA processes, with due consideration being given to the potential for DEP and SEP to have a significant effect on the environment in EEA States. No significant transboundary impacts have been identified at this stage. This will be confirmed through the submission of the Environmental Statement that will be submitted alongside the DCO application. Further statutory transboundary consultation will be undertaken by the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with Regulation 32 of the EIA Regulations, if and when it accepts the DCO application for examination.

### 31.10References

Planning Inspectorate (2018) Advice Note 12 Transboundary Impacts and Process.
Planning Inspectorate (2019). Scoping Opinion for Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extensions.
Planning Inspectorate (2020). Transboundary screening undertaken by the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) on behalf of the Secretary of State (SoS) for the purposes of Regulation 32 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the 2017 EIA Regulations) ['First Transboundary Screening']. Dated 24 January 2020
RHDHV (2019). Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extensions Scoping Report
RHDHV (2020). Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extensions Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening.