



Eastern Green Link 2 - Marine Scheme

Environmental Appraisal Report

Volume 3

Appendix 3.1 - Marine Plans Compliance Checklist

nationalgrid



National Grid Electricity Transmission and Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission plc

June 2022

Prepared for:

National Grid Electricity Transmission and
Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Plc

Prepared by:

AECOM UK Limited
1 Tanfield
Edinburgh EH3 5DA
United Kingdom

T: +44 131 301 8600
aecom.com

In association with:

Xodus Group (Shipping and Navigation);

Wessex Archaeology (Marine Archaeology); and

Brown and May Marine Ltd. (Commercial Fisheries).

© 2022 AECOM UK Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM UK Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

3.1	Marine Plan Compliance Checklist	1
3.1.1	Introduction.....	1
3.1.2	Scottish National Marine Plan	2
3.1.3	North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan (England)	12
3.1.4	East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan.....	23

Tables

Table 3.1-1:	Relevant Policy Within the Scottish National Marine Plan.....	2
Table 3.1-2:	Relevant Policy Within North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan.....	12
Table 3.1-3:	Relevant Policy Within East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan.....	23

3.1 Marine Plan Compliance Checklist

3.1.1 Introduction

Marine Plans, together with the Marine Policy Statement (MPS), underpin the planning system introduced through the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 for Scottish territorial waters, and the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 for England's territorial waters and Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and Scottish offshore waters. The overall aim of Marine Plans is to set out to provide a clear approach for managing the relevant Marine Plan Areas, their resources and the activities and interactions that take place within them.

This document provides a checklist against which the policies from the Scottish National Marine Plan¹, North East Inshore and North East Offshore Marine Plan², and East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans³ with the Marine Scheme to test and demonstrate compliance.

¹ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scotlands-national-marine-plan/>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-north-east-marine-plans-documents>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/east-inshore-and-east-offshore-marine-plans>

3.1.2 Scottish National Marine Plan

Table 3.1-1: Relevant Policy Within the Scottish National Marine Plan

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
General Policies	GEN 1 General Planning Policy	There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and use of the marine environment when consistent with the policies and objectives of this Plan.	This appendix provides a checklist of these policies to signpost where and how they have been considered in the production of this Environmental Appraisal Report (EAR) and to demonstrate compliance	Direct Policy Compliance
	GEN 2 Economic Benefit	Sustainable development and use which provides economic benefit to Scottish communities is encouraged when consistent with the objectives and policies of this Plan.	The overarching Project is for the reinforcement of electrical transmission infrastructure to facilitate increased renewable electricity generation and movement of that electricity between Scotland and England. More widely, the Marine Scheme represents significant investment in the UK low-carbon economy, and is supportive of the wider transition to Net Zero by 2045 in Scotland.	Direct Policy Compliance
	GEN 4 Coexistence	Proposals which enable coexistence with other development sectors and activities within the Scottish marine area are encouraged in planning and decision-making processes, when consistent with policies and objectives of the Plan.	The Applicants are committed to co-existence between the Marine Scheme and other users of the marine environment, including for example commercial fishing. Embedded mitigation measures described in Chapter 2: Project Description, and additional mitigation measures described in technical chapters such as Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation, Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries and Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, have been committed to in order to promote co-existence. Measures include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan⁴ (to be produced post consent once detailed design information becomes available); and • Ongoing liaison and engagement with the fishing industry through lifetime of the Marine Scheme, as required. A summary of consultation with key relevant marine stakeholders is provided in Chapter 6: Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement and its associated appendices. Where relevant, concerns have been recorded and the Marine Scheme has responded where appropriate.	Direct Policy Compliance

⁴ Note that this will be a single document that will perform the role of other fisheries liaison plans, for instance, a Fisheries Management and Mitigation Strategy.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Historic Environment	GEN 6 Historic Environment	Development and use of the marine environment should protect and, where appropriate, enhance heritage assets in a manner proportionate to their significance.	A detailed appraisal of the potential effects of the Marine Scheme on heritage assets are provided in Chapter 12: Marine Archaeology of the EAR, including mitigation to avoid or minimise any adverse effects and maintain the baseline. This appraisal concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
Coastal Process and Flooding	GEN 8 Coastal Process and Flooding	Developments and activities in the marine environment should be resilient to coastal change and flooding, and not have unacceptable adverse impact on coastal processes or contribute to coastal flooding.	The Marine Scheme does not contain any infrastructure located within the intertidal area or nearshore zone inshore of the breakout pit locations (see Chapter 2: Project Description). Therefore, the Marine Scheme is considered resilient to coastal change and flooding. As detailed in Chapter 7: Physical Environment, the Marine Scheme is considered to have no significant effects on coastal processes or contribute to coastal flooding at the Scottish landfall.	Direct Policy Compliance
Natural Heritage	GEN 9 Natural Heritage	Development and use of the marine environment must: (a) Comply with legal requirements for protected areas and protected species. (b) Not result in significant impact on the national status of Priority Marine Features. (c) Protect and, where appropriate, enhance the health of the marine area.	Potential effects of the Marine Scheme on protected areas, protected species and Priority Marine Features have been appraised in Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 10: Marine Mammals and Chapter 11: Ornithology of the EAR and their supporting appendices. These appraisals have concluded no significant residual effects. A Water Framework Directive Assessment Report (Appendix 7.1), Habitats Regulation Assessment (Appendix 8.1) and Marine Protected Area Assessment (Appendix 8.2) have been undertaken to demonstrate compliance with the legal requirements for protected areas and protected species. Together the EAR chapters and appendices demonstrate protection of the health of the marine area.	Direct Policy Compliance
Invasive non-native species	GEN 10 Invasive Non-native Species	Opportunities to reduce the introduction of invasive non-native species to a minimum or proactively improve the practice of existing activity should be taken when decisions are being made.	The risk of introduction of invasive non-native species is considered within Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, and Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology of the EAR, with no significant effects and no requirement for further mitigation being identified. A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be developed post consent following appointment of a principal contractor, which will provide the framework within which best practice measures will be implemented / followed in relation to risks associated with the potential introduction of invasive non-native species.	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Marine Litter	GEN 11 Marine Litter	Developers, users and those accessing the marine environment must take measures to address marine litter where appropriate. Reduction of litter must be taken into account by decision makers.	Embedded mitigation measures as described in Chapter 2: Project Description will ensure that marine litter is addressed. For instance, prior to cable installation activities commencing, a Construction Environment Management Plan including a Waste Management Plan will be developed and agreed with relevant stakeholders in accordance with the coastal and marine site guide. Additionally, all vessels operating will be in compliance with the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL) regulations and will therefore be equipped with waste disposal facilities onboard. Therefore, these measures will ensure that the Marine Scheme will not increase the amount of marine litter.	Direct policy compliance
Water quality and resource	GEN 12 Water Quality and Resource	Developments and activities should not result in a deterioration of the quality of waters to which the Water Framework Directive, Marine Strategy Framework Directive or other related Directives apply.	Potential changes in water quality are reported in Chapter 7: Physical Environment, where the appraisal reported that no significant effects are anticipated. A Water Framework Directive Assessment (Appendix 7.1 of the EAR) has been undertaken confirming that the Marine Scheme's activities will not result in a deterioration of waterbodies having the potential to be affected.	Direct Policy Compliance
Noise	GEN 13 Noise	Development and use in the marine environment should avoid significant adverse effects of man-made noise and vibration, especially on species sensitive to such effects.	The potential effects of underwater noise generated by the activities of the Marine Scheme have been appraised and reported in Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 10: Marine Mammals and Chapter 11: Ornithology of the EAR. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects are predicted as a result of noise and vibration. Subsequently, no project specific mitigation measures are proposed for underwater noise as reported in Chapter 17: Schedule of Mitigation.	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Fairness	GEN 17 Fairness	All marine interests will be treated with fairness and in a transparent manner when decisions are being made in the marine environment.	<p>The Applicants are committed to co-existence between the Marine Scheme and other users of the marine environment, including, for example, commercial fishing.</p> <p>A range of embedded mitigation measures, and where appropriate, project specific mitigation, have been proposed, refer to EAR Volume 2, Chapter 2: Project Description, and Chapter 17: Schedule of Mitigation Commitments.</p> <p>Provisions for the mitigation measures associated with commercial fisheries will be included in the Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (FLCP) that will be produced for the Marine Scheme post-consent once detailed design information becomes available.</p> <p>Liaison and engagement with the fishing industry is on-going and will continue throughout the installation, operational (including maintenance and repair) and decommissioning phases as required. Refer to EAR Volume 2 Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries and Volume 3 Appendix 6.2 Report on Baseline Consultation with Fisheries Stakeholders.</p> <p>A summary of consultation with key relevant maritime stakeholders can be found in Section 13.4.2.2 of EAR Volume 2 Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation. Consultee input has been incorporated where appropriate into Chapter 13 such that concerns, and impacts are recorded, and associated risks are addressed / minimised.</p> <p>The potential interaction of the Marine Scheme with other sea users, including energy industry activities and infrastructure (e.g., oil and gas, renewables), military areas, disposal sites, aquaculture, and recreational users has been appraised in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 15: Other Sea Users.</p>	Direct policy compliance
General	GEN 18 Engagement	Early and effective engagement should be undertaken with the general public and all interested stakeholders to facilitate planning and consenting processes.	Consultation has been undertaken with relevant stakeholders and the general public. The consultation undertaken and the Marine Scheme's response to the points raised is reported in Chapter 6: Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement of the EAR and its supporting appendices.	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Fisheries, Marine Planning Policies	FISHERIES 1	<p>Taking account of the EU's Common Fisheries Policy, Habitats Directive, Birds Directive and Marine Strategy Framework Directive, marine planners and decision makers should aim to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing fishing opportunities and activities are safeguarded wherever possible. An ecosystem-based approach to the management of fishing which ensures sustainable and resilient fish stocks and avoids damage to fragile habitats. Protection for vulnerable stocks (in particular for juvenile and spawning stocks through continuation of sea area closures where appropriate). Improved protection of the seabed and historical and archaeological remains requiring protection through effective identification of high-risk areas and management measures to mitigate the impacts of fishing, where appropriate. That other sectors take into account the need to protect fish stocks and sustain healthy fisheries for both economic and conservation reasons. Delivery of Scotland's international commitments in fisheries, including the ban on discards. <p>Mechanisms for managing conflicts between fishermen and between the fishing sector and other users of the marine environment</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to co-existence between the Marine Scheme and other users of the marine environment, including commercial fishing.</p> <p>A range of embedded mitigation measures as described in Chapter 2: Project Description of the EAR, and additional mitigation measures described in technical chapters such as Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries, have been committed to in order to promote co-existence with the commercial fishing fleet operating in the vicinity of the Marine Scheme.</p> <p>Provisions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (to be produced post consent once detailed design information becomes available); and Ongoing liaison and engagement with the fishing industry through lifetime of the Marine Scheme, as required. <p>A summary of consultation with key commercial fisheries stakeholders is provided in Chapter 6: Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement, Appendix 6.1 and Appendix 6.2 of the EAR. Where relevant, concerns have been recorded and the Marine Scheme has responded.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	FISHERIES 2	<p>The following key factors should be taken into account when deciding on uses of the marine environment and the potential impact on fishing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The cultural and economic importance of fishing, in particular to vulnerable coastal communities. The potential impact (positive and negative) of marine developments on the sustainability of fish and shellfish stocks and resultant fishing opportunities in any given area. The environmental impact on fishing grounds (such as nursery, spawning areas), commercial fisheries species, habitats and species more generally. <p>The potential effect of displacement on: fish stocks; the wider environment; use of fuel; socio-economic costs to fishers and their communities and other marine users.</p>	<p>The potential effects of the Marine Scheme on fish and shellfish stocks, including potential effects on habitats, spawning and nursery grounds (including species of commercial importance) have been considered and assessed in Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology of the EAR. The appraisal concluded no significant residual effects on these receptors.</p> <p>The potential effects on commercial fisheries receptors, as well as the displacement of fishing activities, is considered and appraised in Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries of the EAR. The appraisal concluded no significant residual effects on these receptors.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
	FISHERIES 3	<p>Where existing fishing opportunities or activity cannot be safeguarded, a Fisheries Management and Mitigation Strategy should be prepared by the proposer of development or use, involving full engagement with local fishing interests (and other interests as appropriate) in the development of the Strategy.</p> <p>All efforts should be made to agree the Strategy with those interests. Those interests should also undertake to engage with the proposer and provide transparent and accurate information and data to help complete the Strategy. The Strategy should be drawn up as part of the discharge of conditions of permissions granted.</p> <p>The content of the Strategy should be relevant to the particular circumstances and could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) An assessment of the potential impact of the development or use on the affected fishery or fisheries, both in socio-economic terms and in terms of environmental sustainability. b) A recognition that the disruption to existing fishing opportunities/activity should be minimised as far as possible. c) Reasonable measures to mitigate any constraints which the proposed development or use may place on existing or proposed fishing activity. <p>Reasonable measures to mitigate any potential impacts on sustainability of fish stocks (e.g. impacts on spawning grounds or areas of fish or shellfish abundance) and any socioeconomic impacts.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to co-existence between the Marine Scheme and other users of the marine environment, including for examples commercial fishing.</p> <p>A range of embedded mitigation measures as described in Chapter 2: Project Description of the EAR, and additional mitigation measures are described in technical chapters such as Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries of the EAR have been committed to in order to promote co-existence.</p> <p>Provisions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (to be produced post consent once detailed design information becomes available); and • Ongoing liaison and engagement with the fishing industry through lifetime of the Marine Scheme, as required. <p>A summary of consultation with key relevant marine stakeholders is provided in Chapter 6: Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement, Appendix 6.1 and Appendix 6.2 of the EAR. Where relevant, concerns have been recorded and the Marine Scheme has responded.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Wild Salmon and Diadromous Fish	WILD FISH 1	<p>The impact of development and use of the marine environment on diadromous fish species should be considered in marine planning and decision making processes. Where evidence of impacts on salmon and other diadromous species is inconclusive, mitigation should be adopted where possible and information on impacts on diadromous species from monitoring of developments should be used to inform subsequent marine decision making.</p>	<p>The impact of development and use of the marine environment on diadromous fish species has been appraised in EAR Volume 2, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology. After the implementation of embedded mitigation, no Project Specific Mitigation was deemed necessary. The appraisal concludes with no significant effects.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Offshore Wind and Marine Renewable Energy	RENEWABLES 1	Proposals for commercial scale offshore wind and marine renewable energy development should be sited in the Plan Option areas identified through the Sectoral Marine Plan process. Plan Options are considered the preferred strategic locations for the sustainable development of offshore wind and marine renewables. This preference should be taken into account by marine planners and decision makers if alternative development or use of these areas is being considered. Proposals are subject to licensing and consenting processes.	The Marine Installation Corridor intersects with ScotWind Site 6 between KP64 and KP73 and ScotWind Site 1 between KP91 and KP92. A cumulative appraisal of the potential effects on the environment of both the Marine Scheme and the ScotWind sites has been undertaken and reported in Chapter 16: Cumulative and In-combination Effects. This appraisal concluded no significant cumulative or in-combination effects. Additionally, the Applicants are committed to co-existence between the Marine Scheme and other users of the marine environment, including for examples renewable energy developments.	Direct Policy Compliance
Recreation and Tourism	REC & TOURISM 2	<p>The following key factors should be taken into account when deciding on uses of the marine environment and the potential impact on recreation and tourism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The extent to which the proposal is likely to adversely affect the qualities important to recreational users, including the extent to which proposals may interfere with the physical infrastructure that underpins a recreational activity. b) The extent to which any proposal interferes with access to and along the shore, to the water, use of the resource for recreation or tourism purposes and existing navigational routes or navigational safety. c) Where significant impacts are likely, whether reasonable alternatives can be identified for the proposed activity or development. <p>Where significant impacts are likely and there are no reasonable alternatives, whether mitigation, through recognised and effective measures, can be achieved at no significant cost to the marine recreation or tourism sector interests.</p>	<p>An appraisal of potential effects of the Marine Scheme on marine recreational activities is presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR. In Chapter 15: Other Sea Users, the potential effects of the Marine Scheme were appraised as being not significant.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures described in Chapter 2: Project Description, and additional mitigation measures described in technical chapters such as Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation, Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries and Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, have been committed to which will promote co-existence.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Shipping and Navigation	TRANSPORT 1	<p>Navigational safety in relevant areas used by shipping now and in the future will be protected, adhering to the rights of innocent passage and freedom of navigation contained in UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The following factors will be taken into account when reaching decisions regarding development and use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The extent to which the locational decision interferes with existing or planned routes used by shipping, access to ports and harbours and navigational safety. This includes commercial anchorages and defined approaches to ports. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where interference is likely, whether reasonable alternatives can be identified. ▪ Where there are no reasonable alternatives, whether mitigation through measures adopted in accordance with the principles and procedures established by the International Maritime Organization can be achieved at no significant cost to the shipping or ports sector. 	<p>Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR reports on the risk for the Marine Scheme to interfere with existing and planned routes used by shipping, access to existing ports and harbours and navigational safety. The appraisal concludes no significant residual effects.</p> <p>The design of the Marine Scheme, as reported in Chapter 2: Project Description of the EAR, includes a description of embedded mitigation measures in relation to navigational safety. Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR also identifies additional mitigation measures required to reduce any potential effects to as low as reasonably practicable.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	TRANSPORT 2	<p>Marine development and use should not be permitted where it will restrict access to, or future expansion of, major commercial ports or existing or proposed ports and harbours which are identified as National Developments in the current NPF or as priorities in the National Renewables Infrastructure Plan (Map 10 and 11).</p>	<p>The potential effects on existing and proposed ports and harbours relevant to the Marine Scheme are discussed in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR. Across all phases of the Marine Scheme, all impacts were assessed to be 'tolerable' or 'broadly acceptable'. Following the implementation of the additional risk mitigation measures, the residual impacts, from all phases of the Marine Scheme, can be considered ALARP, which is considered not significant.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	TRANSPORT 3	<p>Ferry routes and maritime transport to islands and remote mainland areas provide essential connections and should be safeguarded from inappropriate marine development and use that would significantly interfere with their operation. Developments will not be consented where they will unacceptably interfere with lifeline ferry services.</p>	<p>The potential effects on ferry routes and maritime transport routes relevant to the Marine Scheme are discussed in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR. Across all phases of the Marine Scheme, all impacts were assessed to be 'tolerable' or 'broadly acceptable'. Following the implementation of the additional risk mitigation measures, the residual impacts, from all phases of the Marine Scheme, can be considered ALARP, which is considered to be not significant.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
	TRANSPORT 6	Marine planners and decision makers and developers should ensure displacement of shipping is avoided where possible to mitigate against potential increased journey lengths (and associated fuel costs, emissions and impact on journey frequency) and potential impacts on other users and ecologically sensitive areas.	Consideration of the potential displacement of shipping is identified and considered in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR. Across all phases of the Marine Scheme, all impacts were assessed to be 'tolerable' or 'broadly acceptable'. Following the implementation of the additional risk mitigation measures, the residual impacts, from all phases of the Marine Scheme, can be considered ALARP, which is considered to be not significant.	Direct Policy Compliance
Submarine Cables Marine Planning Policies	CABLES 1	<p>Cable and network owners should engage with decision makers at the early planning stage to notify of any intention to lay, repair or replace cables before routes are selected and agreed. When making proposals, cable and network owners and marine users should evidence that they have taken a joined-up approach to development and activity to minimise impacts, where possible, on the marine historic and natural environment, the assets, infrastructures and other users. Appropriate and proportionate environmental consideration and risk assessments should be provided which may include cable protection measures and mitigation plans.</p> <p>Any deposit, removal or dredging carried out for the purpose of executing emergency inspection or repair works to any cable is exempt from the marine licensing regime with approval by Scottish Ministers. However, cable replacement requires a marine licence. Marine Licensing Guidance should be followed when considering any cable development and activity.</p>	<p>The Applicants started engaging with the decision makers (MS-LOT and MMO) in 2019. All engagement is detailed in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 6: Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement. Meetings were held during the Options Appraisal phases, as detailed in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Development.</p> <p>A formal EIA screening request was submitted to MS-LOT and the MMO. MS-LOT confirmed that the Marine Scheme in Scottish waters was not deemed EIA Development in December 2020. The MMO advised that screening for EIA in English waters is not possible since the installation of a cable within the UK Marine Area is not listed under the Schedules of the EIA Regulations (16 March 2021. Case Reference EIA/2021/00007).</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, in order to provide MS-LOT and the MMO with information to assess and understand the likely impacts of the Marine Scheme, a non-statutory EAR to allow MS-LOT and the MMO to determine the Marine Licence Applications.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Submarine Cables Marine Planning Policies	CABLES 2	<p>Cables should be suitably routed to provide sufficient requirements for installation and cable protection.</p> <p>New cables should implement methods to minimise impacts on the environment, seabed and other users, where operationally possible and in accordance with relevant industry practice.</p> <p>Cables should be buried to maximise protection where there are safety or seabed stability risks and to reduce conflict with other marine users and to protect the assets and infrastructure.</p> <p>Where burial is demonstrated not to be feasible, cables may be suitably protected through recognised and approved measures (such as rock or mattress placement or cable armouring) where practicable and cost-effective and as risk assessments direct.</p> <p>Consideration of the need to reinstate the seabed, undertake post-lay surveys and monitoring and carry out remedial action where required.</p>	<p>EAR Volume 2 Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Development describes the evolution of the design of the Marine Scheme and the alternatives considered to reach a solution that balances the need for a technically feasible and economically viable route whilst limited the disturbance to people, existing marine users and the environment.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation measures summarised in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 17: Schedule of Mitigation Commitments will minimise the impacts of the environment, seabed and other others.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 2: Project Description of the EAR, it is the preference of the Applicants to bury the cables wherever possible to a minimum depth of 0.6 m and a target depth of 1.5 m. Where this is not feasible because of seabed conditions or where third-party infrastructure is to be crossed, additional cable protection measures will be used.</p> <p>Options for decommissioning the Marine Scheme at the end of its operational life have also been described in Chapter 2: Project Description and considered as part of the appraisal reported in the technical chapters of the EAR.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Submarine Cables	CABLES 3	A risk-based approach should be applied by network owners and decision makers to the removal of redundant submarine cables, with consideration given to cables being left in situ where this would minimise impacts on the marine historic and natural environment and other users.	Options for decommissioning the Marine Scheme at the end of its operational life have also been described in Chapter 2: Project Description and considered as part of the appraisal process in the technical chapters of the EAR.	Direct Policy Compliance
Defence	DEFENCE 2	For the purposes of national defence, the MOD may establish by-laws for exclusions and closures of sea areas. In most areas this will mean temporary exclusive use of areas by the MOD. Where potential for conflict with other users is identified, appropriate mitigation will be identified and agreed with the MOD, prior to planning permission, a marine licence, or other consent being granted.	All engagement is outlined in Chapter 6: Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement of the EAR and its associated appendices. Consultation with the MOD was undertaken during the non-statutory scoping exercise, and no concerns were identified.	Direct Policy Compliance
Aggregates	AGGREGATES 1	Marine planners and decision makers should consider the impacts of other development or activity on areas of marine aggregate or mineral resource. Where an interaction is identified, consideration should be given to whether there are permissions for aggregate or mineral extraction and whether they require any degree of safeguarding.	As presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, there are no marine aggregate extraction sites or mineral resource within 10 km of the Marine Installation Corridor.	Not applicable

3.1.3 North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan (England)

Relevant plan objectives related to cable infrastructure are summarised in Table 3.1-2.

Table 3.1-2: Relevant Policy Within North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Co-existence	NE-CO-1	<p>Proposals that optimise the use of space and incorporate opportunities for co-existence and cooperation with existing activities will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on, or displace, existing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate <p>- Adverse impacts so that they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to the co-existence between the Marine Scheme and other users of the sea, including, for example, commercial fisheries. The potential for interaction with other users has been considered within Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation, Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries and Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR.</p> <p>A range of mitigation measures have been identified to promote co-existence including a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan which will be produced post consent, once detailed design information becomes available, and a Contractor appointed.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Aggregates	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 will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate <p>- Significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction 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>As presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, there are no marine aggregate extraction sites or mineral resource within 10 km of the Marine Installation Corridor.</p>	Not applicable.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Aquaculture	NE-AQ-1	<p>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 will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate</p> <p>- Adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production 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>There are no active, inactive, or deregistered marine aquaculture sites in the Marine Installation Corridor.</p> <p>Between KP396 and KP435, the Marine Installation Corridor crosses strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production, however, the Marine Scheme is considered to be compatible with any future sustainable aquaculture production.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Cables	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. Where burial or protection measures are not appropriate, proposals should state the case for proceeding without those measures.</p>	<p>As described in Chapter 2: Project Description of the EAR, it is the preference of the Applicants to trench the cables wherever possible to a minimum depth of lowering of 0.6 m and a target depth of lowering of 1.5 m. Where this is not feasible because of seabed conditions or where third-party infrastructure is to be crossed, additional cable protection measures will be used.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	NE-CAB-2	<p>Proposals demonstrating compatibility with existing landfall sites and incorporating measures to enable development of future landfall opportunities should be supported. Where this is not possible proposals will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate</p> <p>- Adverse impacts on existing and potential future landfall sites 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 Marine Scheme does not landfall within the North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Area; therefore, this policy is not applicable to the Marine Scheme.</p>	Not applicable

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
	NE-CAB-3	Where seeking to locate close to existing subsea cables, proposals should demonstrate compatibility with ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning activities relating to the cable.	Consultation with the owners of existing assets is ongoing and, as described in Chapter 2: Project Description of the EAR, crossing agreements will be put in place in accordance with the International Cable Protection Committee recommendations to ensure that the Marine Scheme does not interfere with the ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning activities of third-party assets.	Direct Policy Compliance
Dredging and Disposal	NE-DD-1	In areas of authorised dredging activity, including those subject to navigational dredging, proposals for other activities will not be supported unless they are compatible with the dredging activity.	As presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, there are no marine aggregate extraction sites, mineral resource or disposal sites within 10 km of the Marine Installation Corridor within the North East Marine Plan Area.	Not applicable
	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 will, 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.		Not applicable
Oil and Gas	NE-OG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for oil and gas has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with the oil and gas activity.	Within English waters, between KP259 and KP340, the Marine Installation Corridor crosses six licensed oil and gas blocks, namely Blocks 35/23, 35/28, 41/3, 41/4, 41/9, and 41/10a, all of which are extant; as they are not currently operation.	Not applicable

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Ports, Harbours and Shipping	NE-PS-1	<p>In line with the National Policy Statement for Ports, sustainable port and harbour development should be supported. Only proposals demonstrating compatibility with current port and harbour activities will 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, will not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon future opportunity for sustainable expansion of port and harbour activities, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	Ports and harbours relevant to the Marine Scheme have been appraised for potential impacts. This is presented alongside the mitigation measures (as described in Chapter 2: Project Description) required to reduce these potential risks in relation to safety of navigation as detailed in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR. No significant residual effects were concluded by the appraisal.	Direct Policy Compliance
	NE-PS-2	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	No International Maritime Organization routing systems have been identified within the study area for the shipping and navigation appraisal as presented in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR.	Not Applicable
	NE-PS-3	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 viability of passenger services, must not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.	The Marine Scheme has the potential to reduce under-keel clearance through the use of rock protection. The potential effect of this on important navigation routes has been considered with Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR.	Direct Policy Compliance
Renewables	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 will not reduce the ability to construct, operate or decommission the existing or planned energy generation project.	No renewable developments (such as offshore wave and tidal) were identified within the vicinity of the Marine Installation Corridor within the North East Marine Plan Area.	Direct policy compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Heritage Assets	NE-HER-1	<p>Proposals that demonstrate they will conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets will be supported.</p> <p>Where proposals may cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, proponents must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate <p>- Any harm to the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>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>An appraisal of the Marine Scheme's potential impacts on marine heritage assets has been provided in Chapter 12: Marine Archaeology and its supporting appendix (Appendix 12.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report) of the EAR. This appraisal includes mitigation to avoid or minimise potential effects and concluded no significant residual effects.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Fisheries	NE-FISH-1	<p>Proposals that support a sustainable fishing industry, including the industry's diversification, should be supported.</p>	<p>The potential effects of the Marine Scheme on fishing activities have been considered in Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries and Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR. These chapters have identified a range of mitigation measures to promote co-existence including a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan which will be produced post consent once detailed design information becomes available.</p> <p>Liaison and engagement with fishers has been undertaken throughout the appraisal process and this ongoing liaison via a Fisheries Liaison Officer is committed to by the Applicants through the Installation Phase of the t Marine Scheme.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	NE-FISH-2	<p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on access for fishing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate <p>- Adverse impacts so that they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.</p>		Direct Policy Compliance
	NE-FISH-3	<p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds and migratory routes must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate <p>- Adverse impacts so that they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.</p>		Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Employment	NE-EMP-1	Proposals that result in a net increase in marine-related employment will be supported, particularly where they meet one or more of the following: 1) are aligned with local skills strategies and support the skills available 2) create a diversity of opportunities 3) create employment in locations identified as the most deprived 4) implement new technologies - in, and adjacent to, the north east marine plan areas.	The overarching Project is for the reinforcement of electrical transmission infrastructure to facilitate increased renewable electricity generation and movement of that electricity between Scotland and England. More widely, the Marine Scheme represents significant investment in the UK low-carbon economy, and is supportive of the wider transition to Net Zero by 2050 in England.	Direct policy compliance
Climate Change	NE-CC-1	Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on habitats that provide a flood defence or carbon sequestration ecosystem service must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate - Adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) Compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.	The Marine Scheme does not landfall within the North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Area. Additionally, the Marine Scheme is considered to be sufficiently located offshore from the coastline within the Marine Plan Area to avoid any significant effects at the coastline that may affect flood defences or carbon sequestration ecosystem services.	Direct Policy Compliance
Climate Change	NE-CC-2	Proposals in the north east marine plan areas should demonstrate for the lifetime of the project that they are resilient to the impacts of climate change and coastal change.	As the UK transitions away from traditional forms of fuel to power vehicles and heat homes there will be a greater need for renewable and low carbon electricity. This Project is a major reinforcement of the UK electricity transmission system which will provide additional transmission capacity from north and south across transmission network boundaries, ensuring that green energy is transported from where it is produced to where it is needed, economically and efficiently. Potential impacts associated with climate change, and metocean and physical processes are considered in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 7: Physical Environment.	Direct policy compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Climate Change	NE-CC-3	<p>Proposals in the north east 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 areas, should only be supported if they can demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>Potential impacts associated with climate change, and metocean and physical processes are considered in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 7: Physical Environment.</p>	Direct policy compliance
Marine Litter	NE-ML-2	<p>Proposals that facilitate waste re-use or recycling to reduce or remove marine litter will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that could potentially increase the amount of marine litter in the marine plan areas must include measures to, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate - waste entering the marine environment.</p>	<p>Embedded mitigation measures as described in Chapter 2: Project Description will ensure that marine litter is addressed. For instance, prior to cable installation activities commencing, a Construction Environment Management Plan including a Waste Management Plan will be developed and agreed with relevant stakeholders in accordance with the coastal and marine site guide. Additionally, all vessels operating will be in compliance with the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL) regulations and will therefore be equipped with waste disposal facilities onboard. Therefore, these measures will ensure that the Marine Scheme will not increase the amount of marine litter.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Water Quality	NE-WQ-1	<p>Proposals that protect, enhance and restore water quality will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that cause deterioration of water quality must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate - deterioration of water quality in the marine environment.</p>	<p>The current status of water bodies and bathing waters within the study area have been identified and the potential for their deterioration during various stages of the Marine Scheme is appraised. See Chapter 7: Physical Environment and Appendix 7.1: Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment Report of the EAR for further details.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Tourism and Recreation	NE-TR-1	Proposals that promote or facilitate sustainable tourism and recreation activities, or that create appropriate opportunities to expand or diversify the current use of facilities, should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate - Adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	An appraisal of potential impacts upon marine tourism and recreation is presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, including embedded mitigation as described in Chapter 2: Project Description. The appraisal concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
Defence	NE-DEF-1	Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence areas should only be authorised with agreement from the Ministry of Defence.	Consultation with the MOD was undertaken during the non-statutory scoping exercise and no concerns were identified.	Direct Policy Compliance
Marine Protected Areas	NE-MPA-1	Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network will be supported. Proposals that may have adverse impacts on the objectives of marine protected areas must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate adverse impacts, with due regard given to statutory advice on an ecologically coherent network.	The potential impact of the Marine Scheme on marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network has been appraised and reported in the EAR chapters and appendices. See Chapter 7: Physical Environment, Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 10: Marine Mammals, Chapter 11: Ornithology, Appendix 8.2: Marine Protected Area and Marine Conservation Zone Report and Appendix 8.3: Habitats Regulation Assessment Report. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
	NE-MPA-2	Proposals that enhance a marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change, enhancing the resilience of the marine protected area network, will be supported. 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 will, in order of preference: a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate adverse impacts.	The potential impact of the Marine Scheme on marine protected areas has been appraised and reported in Appendix 8.3: Marine Protected Area and Marine Conservation Zone Assessment provided in the EAR, which includes consideration of embedded mitigation, as described in Chapter 2: Project Description. This concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
	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.	The potential effects of the Marine Scheme on priority habitats and species have been appraised in the relevant technical chapters of the EAR. These include Chapter 7: Physical Environment, Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish and Chapter 10: Marine	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Biodiversity	NE-BIO-1	Proposals that enhance the distribution of priority habitats and priority species will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on the distribution of priority habitats and priority species must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.	Mammals. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
	NE-BIO-2	Proposals that enhance or facilitate native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, will be supported. Proposals that may cause significant adverse impacts on native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.	The potential effects of the Marine Scheme on native species have been appraised (including the consideration of embedded mitigation as described in Chapter 2: Project Description) in the relevant technical chapters of the EAR. These include Chapter 7: Physical Environment, Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 10: Marine Mammals and Chapter 11: Ornithology. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
	NE-BIO-3	Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of ecosystem services, will be supported. 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 will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate d) compensate for net habitat loss.	The Marine Scheme does not landfall within the North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Area; therefore, this policy is not applicable to the Marine Scheme.	Not applicable

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Invasive Non-native Species	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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) moving equipment, boats or livestock (for example fish or shellfish) from one water body to another 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. 	<p>The risk of introduction of invasive non-native species has been considered in Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology and Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology of the EAR, which concluded no significant residual effects.</p> <p>A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be developed post consent following appointment of a Contractor, which will provide the framework within which best practice measures will be implemented / followed in relation to risks associated with the potential introduction of invasive non-native species.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Disturbance	NE-DIST-1	<p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on highly mobile species through disturbance or displacement must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. 	<p>The potential impacts on mobile species have been appraised in the EAR technical chapters including Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 10: Marine Mammals and Chapter 11: Ornithology. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Underwater Noise	NE-UWN-1	<p>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.</p>	<p>Consideration of the effects of underwater noise generated by the Marine Scheme has been reported in EAR technical chapters including Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Chapter 10: Marine Mammals. The appraisals consider embedded mitigation as detailed in Chapter 2: Project Description. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Underwater Noise	NE-UWN-2	<p>Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive or non-impulsive noise must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate adverse impacts on highly mobile species so they are no longer significant. 	<p>The impact of underwater noise generated by the Marine Scheme has been appraised in Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Chapter 10: Marine Mammals of the EAR. The appraisals consider embedded mitigation as detailed in Chapter 2: Project Description. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Cumulative Effects	NE-CE-1	<p>Proposals which may have adverse cumulative effects with other existing, authorised, or reasonably foreseeable proposals must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Avoid b) Minimise c) Mitigate <p>- adverse cumulative and/or in-combination effects so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>An appraisal of the potential cumulative effects is presented in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 16: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects. This appraisal concluded no significant effects.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Cross-border co-operation	NE-CBC-1	<p>Proposals must consider cross-border impacts throughout the lifetime of the proposed activity. Proposals that impact upon one or more marine plan areas or terrestrial environments must show evidence of the relevant public authorities (including other countries) being consulted and responses considered.</p>	<p>The Marine Scheme is a cross-border project, passing through both Scottish and English territorial and offshore waters. Details of the Marine Scheme are provided in EAR Volume 2 Chapter 1: Introduction and Chapter 2: Project Description.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

3.1.4 East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan

Relevant plan objectives related to cable infrastructure are summarised in Table 3.1-3.

Table 3.1-3: Relevant Policy Within East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Ecosystem	ECO1	Cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem of the East marine plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial) should be addressed in decision-making and plan implementation.	Consideration of cumulative impacts are provided in Chapter 16: Cumulative and In-combination Effects of the EAR.	Direct Policy Compliance
Marine Pollution	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.	Hazardous substances will be present on Marine Scheme vessels. Embedded mitigation (as described in Chapter 2: Project Description) such as compliance with the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL) regulations, implementation and adherence to control measures and shipboard oil pollution emergency plans (SOPEP) and adherence to MARPOL Annex I requirements will control the risks associated with these substances. Collision risk has been appraised in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation and the potential risk to water quality is appraised in Chapter 7: Physical Environment. Both appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
Biodiversity	BIO1	Appropriate weight should be given to biodiversity, reflecting the need to protect biodiversity as a whole, 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, terrestrial).	The potential effects of the Marine Scheme on biodiversity have been appraised in Chapter 7: Physical Environment, Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 10: Marine Mammals, Chapter 11: Ornithology of the EAR, Appendix 8.2: Marine Protected Area and Marine Conservation Zone Report and Appendix 8.3: Habitats Regulation Assessment Report. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance
	BIO2	Where appropriate, proposals for development should incorporate features that enhance biodiversity and geological interests.		Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Climate Change	CC1	<p>Proposals should take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> how they may be impacted upon by, and respond to, climate change over their lifetime and how they may impact upon any climate change adaptation measures elsewhere during their lifetime <p>Where detrimental impacts on climate change adaptation measures are identified, evidence should be provided as to how the proposal will reduce such impacts.</p>	<p>As the UK transitions away from traditional forms of fuel to power vehicles and heat homes there will be a greater need for renewable and low carbon electricity. This Project is a major reinforcement of the UK electricity transmission system which will provide additional transmission capacity from north and south across transmission network boundaries, ensuring that green energy is transported from where it is produced to where it is needed, economically and efficiently.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	CC2	<p>Proposals for development should minimise emissions of greenhouse gases as far as is appropriate. Mitigation measures will 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>		Direct policy compliance
Economic	EC1	<p>Proposals that provide economic productivity benefits which are additional to Gross Value Added currently generated by existing activities should be supported.</p>	<p>The Project is for the reinforcement of electrical transmission infrastructure to facilitate increased renewable electricity generation and movement of that electricity between Scotland and England.</p> <p>More widely, the Marine Scheme represents significant investment in the UK low-carbon economy, and is supportive of the wider transition to Net Zero by 2050 in England.</p>	Direct policy compliance
	EC2	<p>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.</p>		

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
	EC3	Proposals that will help the East Marine Plan Areas to contribute to offshore wind energy generation should be supported.	As described in Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Development, the proposed landfall for the Marine Scheme was moved to the north to deconflict with the proposed Hornsea 4 Offshore Wind Farm export cable route corridor, which now runs adjacent to Marine Installation Corridor between KP425 to KP431. There is potential however, for simultaneous operations (SIMOPS) to occur during the lifetime of the Marine Scheme and the Hornsea 4 development, for instance where construction periods overlap or where maintenance is required. This has been recognised by the Applicants, and ongoing collaboration with the developers of Hornsea 4 along with adherence to appropriate industry guidance, such as the International Marine Contractors Association (IMCA) guidance on SIMOPS (IMCA M203, Version II 2021) will ensure that both projects can exist simultaneously.	Direct Policy Compliance
Marine Protected Areas	MPA1	Any impacts on the overall Marine Protected Area network must be taken into account of in strategic level measures and assessments, with due regard given to any current agreed advice on an ecologically coherent network.	The potential impact of the Marine Scheme on marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network has been appraised in the chapters and appendices of the EAR. See Chapter 7: Physical Environment, Chapter 8: Benthic Ecology, Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 10: Marine Mammals, Chapter 11: Ornithology, Appendix 8.2: Marine Protected Area and Marine Conservation Zone Report and Appendix 8.3: Habitats Regulation Assessment Report. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Fisheries	FISH1	<p>Within areas of fishing activity, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That they will not prevent fishing activities on, or access to, fishing grounds How, if there are adverse impacts on the ability to undertake fishing activities or access to fishing grounds, they will minimise them How, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated The case for proceeding with their proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts. 	<p>The potential effects of the Marine Scheme on fishing activities have been considered in Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries and Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects.</p> <p>These chapters have identified mitigation measures to promote co-existence including a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan which will be produced post consent once detailed design information becomes available.</p> <p>Liaison and engagement with fishers has been undertaken throughout the appraisal process and this ongoing liaison via a Fisheries Liaison Officer is committed to by the Applicants through the Installation Phase of the Marine Scheme.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	FISH2	<p>Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That they will not have an adverse impact upon spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat How, if there are adverse impacts upon the spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat, they will minimise them How, if the adverse impact cannot be minimised they will be mitigated The case for proceeding with their proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts. 	<p>The potential effects of the Marine Scheme on spawning and nursery areas have been considered in Chapter 9: Fish and Shellfish Ecology of the EAR.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
Aquaculture	AQ1	<p>Within sustainable aquaculture development sites (identified through research), proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That they will 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 How, if there are adverse impacts on aquaculture development, they can be minimised How, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated The case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts. 	<p>There are no active, inactive, or deregistered marine aquaculture sites in the Marine Installation Corridor.</p> <p>Between KP 396 and KP435, the Marine Installation Corridor crosses strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production, however, the Marine Scheme is considered to be compatible with any future sustainable aquaculture production since it is a submarine cable which will either be trenched where seabed conditions allow or will be protected using external protection. Neither will preclude the use of the wider strategic area for aquaculture production.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Ports and Shipping	PS1	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under-keel clearance should not be authorised in International Maritime Organization designated routes.	The Marine Scheme has the potential to reduce under-keel clearance as a result of the use of rock protection. The potential effect of this on important navigation routes has been considered with Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR.	Direct Policy Compliance
	PS2	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure that encroaches upon important navigation routes should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Be compatible with the need to maintain space for safe navigation, avoiding adverse economic impact b) Anticipate and provide for future safe navigational requirements where evidence and/or stakeholder input allows; and c) Account for impacts upon navigation in-combination with other existing and proposed activities. 	The Marine Scheme is a submarine cable and whilst cable protection will form a static object on the seabed, this will be in isolated areas along the Marine Installation Corridor where the minimum depth of lowering cannot be achieved by trenching techniques. Additionally, no important navigation routes have been identified within English waters, as detailed in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR. This policy is therefore considered not to be applicable to the Marine Scheme.	Not Applicable
	PS3	Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That they will not interfere with current activity and future opportunity for expansion of ports and harbours b) How, if the proposal may interfere with current activity and future opportunities for expansion, they will minimise this c) How, if the interference cannot be minimised, it will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the interference. 	Ports and harbours relevant to the Marine Scheme, and potential impacts and mitigation measures required to reduce potential risks in relation to safety of navigation, are presented in Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation of the EAR.	Direct Policy Compliance
Co-existence	GOV2	Opportunities for co-existence should be maximised wherever possible.	The Applicants are committed to the co-existence between the Marine Scheme and other users of the sea including, for example, commercial fisheries. The potential for interaction with other users has been considered within Chapter 13: Shipping and Navigation, Chapter 14: Commercial Fisheries and Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR. These appraisals concluded no significant residual effects. Mitigation measures have been identified to promote co-existence, including a Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan, which will be produced post consent once detailed design information becomes available.	Direct Policy Compliance
	GOV3	Proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That they will avoid displacement of other existing or authorised (but yet to be implemented) activities b) How, if there are adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, they will minimise them c) How, if the adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated against d) The case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts of displacement. 		Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Heritage Assets	SOC2	Proposals that may affect heritage assets should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not compromise or harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset b) how, if there is compromise or harm to a heritage asset, this will be minimised c) how, where compromise or harm to a heritage asset cannot be minimised it will be mitigated against or 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	An appraisal of the Marine Scheme’s potential impacts on marine heritage assets has been provided in Chapter 12: Marine Archaeology and its supporting appendix (Appendix 12.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report) of the EAR. This appraisal includes mitigation to avoid or minimise potential effects and concluded no significant residual effects..	Direct Policy Compliance
Offshore Wind	WIND1	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: a) they can clearly demonstrate that they will not compromise the construction, operation, maintenance, or decommissioning of the Offshore Wind Farm b) the lease/agreement for lease has been surrendered back to The Crown Estate and not been re-tendered c) the lease/agreement for lease has been terminated by the Secretary of State d) in other exceptional circumstances	There are no lease areas or agreement for lease areas that overlap with the Marine Installation Corridor within the East Marine Plan Area. However, existing and proposed cables cross the Marine Installation Corridor or are in close proximity to it which are associated with Offshore Wind Farms. Proximity agreements will be required in order to manage risks including a necessary mitigation and controls including the application of exclusion zones.	Direct Policy Compliance
Cables	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.	As described in Chapter 2: Project Description of the EAR, it is the preference of the Applicants to trench the cables wherever possible to a minimum depth of lowering of approximately 0.6 m and a target depth of lowering of approximately 1.5 m. Where this is not feasible because of seabed conditions or where third-party infrastructure is to be crossed, additional cable protection measures will be used.	Direct Policy Compliance

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Defence	DEF1	Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence Danger and Exercise Areas should not be authorised without agreement from the Ministry of Defence.	Chapter 15: Other Sea Users considers the potential effects of the Marine Scheme on Practice and Exercise Areas as utilised by the MOD and appraised the potential effects as not significant. Furthermore, consultation with the MOD was undertaken during the non-statutory scoping exercise and no concerns were identified, as detailed in Chapter 6: Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement.	Direct Policy Compliance
Oil and Gas	OG1	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.	As described in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users, within English waters, between KP259 and KP340, the Marine Installation Corridor crosses six licensed oil and gas blocks, namely Blocks 35/23, 35/28, 41/3, 41/4, 41/9, and 41/10a, however, there are no current development consents within these blocks.	Direct Policy Compliance
Dredging and Disposal	DD1	Proposals within or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas should demonstrate, in order of preference a) that they will not adversely impact dredging and disposal activities b) how, if there are adverse impacts on dredging and disposal, they will minimise these c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts	As presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, there are no marine aggregate extraction sites or mineral resource within 10 km of the Marine Installation Corridor. The Marine Scheme intersects the closed disposal site at Bridlington Bay B (between KP431 and KP433). The open disposal site of Bridlington Bay A is located 2.2 km to the north of KP429 and therefore the Marine Scheme does not directly interact with disposal activities. The appraisal of potential impacts upon disposal sites is reported within Chapter 15: Other Sea Users which concluded no significant residual effect.	Direct Policy Compliance
Aggregates	AGG3	Within defined areas of high potential aggregate resource, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will not, prevent aggregate extraction b) how, if there are adverse impacts on aggregate extraction, they will minimize these c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimized, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the application if it is not possible to minimize or mitigate the adverse impacts	As discussed in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, there are no marine aggregate extraction sites or mineral resource within 10 km of the Marine Installation Corridor.	Not applicable.

Topic	Policy Code	Policy Extract	How and Where it is Considered	Conclusion
Tourism and Recreation	TR1	<p>Proposals for development should demonstrate that during construction and operation, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) they will not adversely impact tourism and recreation activities b) how, if there are adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts 	<p>An appraisal of potential impacts upon marine tourism and recreation is presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, including consideration of embedded mitigation measures as described in Chapter 2: Project Description. No significant residual effects were concluded by the appraisal.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance
	TR2	<p>Proposals that require static objects in the East marine plan areas, should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) that they will not adversely impact on recreational boating routes b) how, if there are adverse impacts on recreational boating routes, they will minimise them c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts 	<p>An appraisal of potential impacts upon recreational boating routes is presented in Chapter 15: Other Sea Users of the EAR, including consideration of embedded mitigation measures as described in Chapter 2: Project Description. This appraisal reports no significant effects on recreational boating activities within the East Marine Plan Area.</p>	Direct Policy Compliance