

- 12.382. Impact assessment was undertaken to inform the 2012 Offshore ES for the originally consented Project. For the assessment of the optimised Seagreen Project design, the assessment method has been updated to current best practice to define the frequency, consequence and significance of the impacts through the use of matrices (paragraphs 12.48 to 12.51 – ‘Significance Criteria’), rather than simply a statement of whether or not an impact was significant or not significant, as carried out in the 2012 Offshore ES.
- 12.383. Compared to the outcomes of the 2012 Offshore ES, there have been no changes in the significance of impacts in this updated assessment.
- 12.384. In terms of Project Alpha or Project Bravo in isolation, the receptors remain the same in that there will be impacts on commercial vessels, commercial fishing vessels and recreational vessels during all phases of the Project. For construction, all impacts are concluded to be **Not Significant**, as per the 2012 Offshore ES. For the operational phase, SAR operations were also assessed and marine Radar systems were scoped out of the assessment. All operational impacts were also concluded to be **Not Significant**, as per the 2012 Offshore ES. Decommissioning impacts were considered to be broadly similar to those of the construction phase; therefore impacts were only assessed where a notable difference between construction and decommissioning scenarios were identified. No significant impacts were identified for the decommissioning phase as per the 2012 Offshore ES. Therefore impacts have not increased or decreased when compared to the 2012 Offshore ES.
- 12.385. The impacts of Project Alpha and Project Bravo combined have been assessed in both the 2012 Offshore ES and this EIA Report. In the 2012 Offshore ES, Project Alpha and Project Bravo combined had a design envelope of up to 150 WTGs and up to five OSPs. The optimised Seagreen Project assessed in this EIA has a design envelope of up to 120 WTGs and the assessment also included up to 4 OSPs (part of the already licensed Offshore Transmission Asset). The originally consented Project 2012 Offshore ES assessment was not split into the construction, operation and decommissioning phases, as in this EIA Report. Receptors assessed remain the same as those assessed for Project Alpha or Project Bravo in isolation, aside from SAR operations which was not assessed in the 2012 Offshore ES, but has been included this EIA Report.
- 12.386. Decommissioning impacts were considered to be broadly similar to those of the construction phase; therefore impacts were only assessed to the point of discerning if there was a notable difference between scenarios per phase. All impacts were concluded to be **Not Significant** within this EIA Report, as per the 2012 Offshore ES. Therefore impacts have not increased or decreased when compared to the 2012 Offshore ES.
- 12.387. CIA of the originally consented Project with other schemes in the 2012 Offshore ES included assessment with the Inch Cape Offshore Wind Farm and the Neart na Gaoithe Offshore Wind Farm. Both these schemes have been included within the cumulative assessment of the optimised Seagreen Project for this EIA Report, as well as other schemes identified through the 2017 Scoping Opinion and the CIA list (see Appendix 6A and Chapter 6 [EIA Process]).
- 12.388. Cumulative receptors assessed remain the same or less than those assessed for the 2012 Offshore ES in that the impacts on commercial vessels and commercial fishing vessels were assessed. Recreational impacts were not assessed as there was no cumulative pathway identified. All impacts were concluded to be **Not Significant** within this EIA Report and within the 2012 Offshore ES.
- 12.389. It should be noted that no additional mitigation measures are required as no significant adverse impacts are predicted following the impact assessment.

Table 12.11 Summary of Predicted Impacts for the optimised Seagreen project

Receptor	Potential Impact	Phase (C or O)	Impact Significance	Additional Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact Significance
Project Alpha					
Commercial Vessels	Displacement	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters and Collision with Project Alpha Construction Vessels				
	Encounters and Collision with Other Vessels				
	Allision Risk				
Commercial Fishing Vessels	Displacement	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial fishing vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters and Collision with Project Alpha Construction Vessels				
	Encounters and Collision with Other Vessels				
	Allision Risk				
Recreational Vessels	Displacement	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on recreational vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters and Collision with Project Alpha Construction Vessels				
	Encounters and Collision with Other Vessels				
	Allision Risk				
Commercial Vessels	Displacement	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk				
Commercial Fishing Vessels	Displacement	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial fishing vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk				

Receptor	Potential Impact	Phase (C or O)	Impact Significance	Additional Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact Significance
Recreational Vessels	Displacement	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on recreational vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk				
SAR Operations	Diminishment of Emergency Response Resources	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on SAR operations during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
Project Bravo					
Commercial Vessels	Displacement	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters and Collision with Project Bravo Construction Vessels				
	Encounters and Collision with Other Vessels				
Commercial Fishing Vessels	Allision Risk	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial fishing vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Displacement, Encounters and Collision Risk				
Recreational Vessels	Allision Risk	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on recreational vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Displacement, Encounters and Collision Risk				
Commercial Vessels	Allision Risk	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Displacement				
Commercial Vessels	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Displacement				

Receptor	Potential Impact	Phase (C or O)	Impact Significance	Additional Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact Significance
Commercial Fishing Vessels	Displacement	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial fishing vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk				
Recreational Vessels	Displacement	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on recreational vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk				
SAR Operations	Diminishment of Emergency Response Resources	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on SAR operations during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
Projects Alpha and Bravo Combined					
Commercial Vessels	Displacement	C	Tolerable with Mitigation (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Tolerable with Mitigation (Not Significant)
	Encounters and Collision with Optimised Seagreen Project Construction Vessels				
	Encounters and Collision with Other Vessels				
	Allision Risk				
Commercial Fishing Vessels	Displacement, Encounters and Collision Risk	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial fishing vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Allision Risk				
Recreational Vessels	Displacement, Encounters and Collision Risk	C	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on recreational vessels during construction as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Allision Risk				

Receptor	Potential Impact	Phase (C or O)	Impact Significance	Additional Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact Significance
Commercial Vessels	Displacement	O	Tolerable with Mitigation (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Tolerable with Mitigation (Not Significant)
	Encounters and Collision Risk				
	Allision Risk				
Commercial Fishing Vessels	Displacement	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on commercial fishing vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk				
Recreational Vessels	Displacement	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on recreational vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Encounters, Collision and Allision Risk				
SAR Operations	Diminishment of Emergency Response Resources	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to impacts on SAR operations during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
Decommissioning Phase					
The impacts associated with decommissioning of the optimised Seagreen Project are anticipated to be similar in nature and extent to those described for the construction phase.					
CIA – Construction and Decommissioning					
Given the low data confidence it is not possible to undertake a detailed cumulative assessment of a realistic WCS during the construction and decommissioning for shipping and navigation. However if simultaneous construction is considered worst case then it is assumed that post consent environmental measures deployed by maritime regulators would ensure that any impacts on commercial vessels or commercial fishing vessels would be effectively mitigated and impacts would be 'Tolerable with Mitigation' (Not Significant).					

Receptor	Potential Impact	Phase (C or O)	Impact Significance	Additional Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact Significance
CIA - Operation					
Commercial Vessels	Displacement, Encounters and Collision Risk	O	Tolerable with Mitigation (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to cumulative impacts on commercial vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted. Construction and decommissioning impacts are not expected to exceed those of the operational phase.	Tolerable with Mitigation (Not Significant)
	Allision Risk				
Commercial Fishing Vessels	Displacement, Encounters and Collision Risk	O	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)	No additional mitigation is required or proposed in relation to cumulative impacts on commercial fishing vessels during operation as no adverse significant impacts are predicted. Construction and decommissioning impacts are not expected to exceed those of the operational phase.	Broadly Acceptable (Not Significant)
	Allision Risk				
Key: C = Construction, O = Operational					

REFERENCES

- DECC. 2005. DECC Methodology for Assessing the Marine Navigational Safety Risks of Offshore Wind Farms. DECC, London.
- IALA. 2013. IALA Recommendations O-139 on the Marking of Man-Made Offshore Structures. Edition 2. IALA, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, France.
- IMO. 1972. International Regulations for the Prevention of Collisions at Sea. IMO, London.
- IMO. 1974. Convention on the Safety of Life at Sea. IMO, London.
- IMO. 2007. Consolidated text of the Guidelines for FSA for use in the IMO rule-making Process. (MSC/ Circ. 2013-MEPC/ Circ. 392). IMO, London.
- Marine Scotland. 2015. Scotland's National Marine Plan. Chapter 13. Shipping, Ports, Harbours and Ferries. Marine Scotland, Edinburgh.
- MCA. 2008, Marine Guidance Note 372 (M+F) Guidance to Mariners Operating in the Vicinity of UK OREIs. MCA, Southampton.
- MCA. 2015, Methodology for Assessing Marine Navigational Risks of Offshore Wind Farms. MCA, Southampton.
- MCA. 2016. Marine Guidance Note 543 (M+F) – Safety of Navigation: OREIs – Guidance on UK Navigational Practice, Safety and Emergency Response. MCA, Southampton.
- MCA. 2017. The SAR Framework for the UK and Northern Ireland. MCA, Southampton.
- MS-LOT. 2017. MS-LOT: Scoping Opinion for Seagreen Phase 1 Offshore Project. Marine Scotland, Aberdeen.
- The Recreational Craft Regulations 2017, No. 737, Available at:
https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/737/pdfs/ukxi_20170737_en.pdf
- RYA. 2015. The RYA's Position on Offshore Renewable Energy Developments: Paper 1 – Wind Energy. RYA, Southampton.
- RYA, 2016. RYA UK Coastal Atlas of Recreational Boating 2.0. RYA, Southampton.
- Seagreen. 2010. Seagreen Phase 1 Scoping Report. Document No. A6SW/SEAG-Z-DEV230-SWR-020-A3. Seagreen, Glasgow.
- Seagreen. 2017a. Seagreen Phase 1 Offshore Project Scoping Report: Round 3: Firth of Forth. Document No. A4MR/SEAG-AB-DEV230-SPR-311, Seagreen, Glasgow.
- UKHO, 2016. Admiralty Sailing Directions, North Sea (West) Pilot, NP 54. UKHO, Somerset.