RECORD OF THE HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT UNDERTAKEN UNDER REGULATION 5 OF THE OFFSHORE PETROLEUM ACTIVITIES (CONSERVATION of HABITATS) REGULATIONS 2001 (As Amended).

Document Version	Date Published	Summary of Changes
1.0		Document created
2.0		Edits following internal review
3.0		Edits following JNCC review

Project Details		
Application reference	Pegasus West Geological Survey	
Date application received:	11/03/2025	
Applicant details	INEOS UK SNS Ltd	
Applications Being Applied	GS/1886/0	
for		

Contents

Description of the Activity	2
Requirement for a Habitats Regulations Assessment	4
Stage 1: Test of likely Significant effects (LSE)	4
Pressures associated with the activity	4
Screening of protected sites	5
LSE Assessment	5
LSE Conclusion: Alone	9
LSE In-combination assessment	10
LSE Conclusion: In-combination	11
Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment	12
Appropriate Assessment: Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)	13
In-combination Assessment: Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)	13
Projects Considered In-combination	13

	Offshore Petroleum Regulator for Environment & Decommissioning	
	Appropriate Assessment	. 13
(Conclusion of Habitats Regulations Assessment	. 18
ŀ	Annex	. 19

Description of the Activity

1.923.

INEOS are planning to undertake a geophysical, shallow geotechnical and environmental survey at the proposed Pegasus West field development site, including the proposed pipeline route from the Breagh A platform to Pegasus West. The survey will provide information to inform the planning and assessment of the proposed Pegasus development.

The survey will require the use of the following equipment:

- Sub Bottom Profilers
- Geotechncial sampling Virbo cores and Cone penetration testing
- Grab sampling (Van Veen)
- Other Acoustic surveys Multibeam, sidescan, magnetometer. These systems do not require consent and just notification to the Department.

The survey work will be undertaken from a single survey vessel

Details of the two sub bottom profilers are outlined below:

Parameter	SBP (Innomar)	SBP (Sparker)
Energy Source Type:	Innomar Medium-70	AAE Dura400/400
Water depth:	c. 19 - 65 m	c. 19 - 65 m
Shot interval:	0.025 seconds	0.25 seconds
SPL@ 1m: dB re 1 μPa	246 dB re 1 μPa²-s	226 dB re 1 μPa²-s
(peak):		
SEL@ 1m: dB re 1 μPa2s:	223 dB re 1 μPa²-s	197.8 dB re 1 µPa²-s
Peak energy frequency:	12 kHz	1 kHz
Number of cables:	0	2
Length of towed equipment:	N/A	180 m
Width of towed equipment:	N/A	1.5 m
Survey speed:	4 knots	4 knots
Sail line spacing:	50 m	50 m
Estimated number of turns:	150	150
Estimated duration of line	35 minutes	35 minutes
turns:		

Table 1: Details of Survey Equipment Requiring Consent

Location



Figure 1: Location of the Pegasus West Survey location

The survey is in Quadrants 42 and 43 (in Seaward Production Licence P2662). The Pegasus West site survey operations will be undertaken within a 2.5 km by 13.6 km area (34 km2) centred on the proposed Pegasus West drill centre location in the UKCS Blocks 43/12 and 43/13.

The pipeline route survey operations will be undertaken along ca. 59 km of the proposed pipeline route across a width of 450 m (26.55 km2) in the UKCS Blocks 42/13, 42/14, 42/15, 43/11 and 43/12. The last 6 km of the proposed pipeline route will be covered by the proposed site survey area.

The spatial extent of the Pegasus West greater working area (including line turns) is approximately

395 km2 and is located approximately 59 kilometres (km) northeast of the Yorkshire coastline at its closest point and approximately 78 km from the UK / Netherlands transboundary line Note, the geophysical survey equipment will be switched off during line turns in the greater working area.

Timing

The operations are scheduled to commence on 15th April 2025, at the earliest, and will last for up to 40 days. To account for potential scheduling, operational and weather delays, the marine survey consent is requested until 30th June 2025.

Requirement for a Habitats Regulations Assessment

Regulation 5 of the Offshore Petroleum Activities (Conservation of Habitats) Regulations 2001 (As amended) outlines that the Secretary of State (SoS), before agreeing to the grant of consent of any activity which is likely to have a significant on a relevant site, make an appropriate assessment of the implications for the site in view of its conservation objectives. This document is the record of the SoS appropriate assessment.

Where the term 'Site' is used within this document, it means any site forming the UK National Site Network site. The National Site Network is the UK network of protected sites on land and sea which were designated under the Habitats and Wild Birds directives namely Special Protection Areas (SPA) or Special Areas of Conservation (SAC).

The assessment will first determine what sites and protected features are likely to have conservation objectives which could be significantly affected by the activity and will then proceed to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implication of these effects on the site's integrity.

Stage 1: Test of likely Significant effects (LSE)

Is the activity likely to have a significant effect on the site's conservation objectives?

Pressures associated with the activity

The project is considered to exert the following pressures on the environment:

Underwater noise (impulsive noise)

Impulsive underwater noise will be emitted from the sub bottom profiler units. This noise will be loud enough and of the right frequency range to cause injury and disturbance to marine mammals. Impulsive noise from multibeam and sidescan sonar will also be emitted but this

sound is of a frequency, directionality and source level that will not cause significant effects on marine life and noise from these sources will not be considered further within the assessment.

Underwater noise (non-impulsive noise)

Underwater noise from non-impulsive sources such as vessel engines and coring systems will be generated during the survey.

Seabed disturbance

The collection of grab samples, cores and geotechnical investigations will require the removal of small amounts of sediment and the positioning of equipment on the seabed which will cause disturbance of sediments and benthic fauna.

Grab samples: Up to 56 stations will be subject to grab sampling, with three grabs at each station. Each grab will impact an area of $0.1m^2$ totalling $7m^2$.

Geotechnical: 48 Cone Penetration and 48 Vibrocore tests will be performed which will disturb an are of 1m².

Screening of protected sites

The activity is within the following sites:

- Southern North Sea (SNS) SAC
- Dogger Bank SAC

Screened out of the LSE screening assessment

There is no pathway for potential effects on the other sites due to the large distance between other sites and the project area. There is also no mechanism whereby the project could impact (in any meaningful way) highly mobile species associated with protected sites i.e. seabirds or marine mammals. (Figure 1).

LSE Assessment

Site features and conservation objectives are taken from relevant SNCB conservation advice packages found on the following webpages:

- <u>https://jncc.gov.uk/our-work/southern-north-sea-mpa/</u>
- <u>https://jncc.gov.uk/our-work/dogger-bank-mpa/</u>

Table 1. Test of likely significant Effect

Pressures exerted by	Feature	Is there likely to be a significant effect on the conservation Objectives <u>alone</u>	
Activity			
Southern North Sea S	AC		
Underwater noise	Harbour porpoise	No.	
(impulsive:	(Phocoena phocoena)		
geophysical survey)		The project area supports high numbers of harbour porpoise and the proposed operations take	
		place in the summer area of the SNS SAC during between March 2025 and December 2025, with	
		surveys taking place between April 2025 and 30 th June 2025.	
		Injuny risk:	
		Noise modelling undertaken indicates that there is notential for sound levels to cause the onset	
		of permanent threshold shift (PTS) to barbour porpoise out to 750 m. The developer explains that	
		this modelling has produced an over precautionary result, and that PTS is highly unlikely to occur	
		out to such a range. This assumption is supported by the fact that other applications for sub	
		ottom profiling surveys (a very common place activity) does not normally produce such large	
		PTS ranges and SBP surveys are not associated with a high injury risk. It is expected that any risk	
		of killing or injury to a marine mammal will be avoided through the implementation and	
		adherence to the JNCC's standard "protocol for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals	
		from geophysical surveys".	
		Disturbance:	
		The SNCB guidance on noise management in harbour porpoise SACs states a plan/project,	
		individually or in combination, is significant if it excludes harbour	
		porpoises from more than:	
		• 20% of the relevant area of the site in any given day, or	
		• 20% of the relevant area of the site in any given day, of	
		an average of 10% of the relevant area of the site over a season The SNCP guideness also appigne standardized disturbance distances for botheur perceise	
		the SNOD guidance also assigns standardised disturbance distances for harbour porpoise	
1		because of different activities. These are termed effective deterrent ranges (EDRs) and it is	

Pressures exerted by	Feature	Is there likely to be a significant effect on the conservation Objectives <u>alone</u>
Activity		
		assumed that within this EDR harbour porpoise will be disturbed to an extent where they flee the area, effectively displacing porpoise from regions of the SAC.
		The use of sub bottom profilers requires the use of a 5 km EDR, which extends to the whole area around the survey vessel. The developer has calculated the area of sea within which harbour porpoise may experience disturbance within a 24-hour period, by calculating the longest distance that the vessel may transit while undertaking survey activities and apply the EDR as a spatial buffer around this vessel route, this results in an area of 471.64km ² . The percentage of the summer area of the SNS SAC that may be excluded because of the proposed operations is 1.75% per day. The contribution to the seasonal average disturbance is 0.11%
		Based on the predicted extent of potential impacts, it is concluded that there is no potential for a likely significant effect on harbour porpoise from the proposed activity within or adjacent to the Southern North Sea SAC when considered alone.
Underwater noise	Harbour porpoise	No.
(non-impulsive:	(Phocoena phocoena)	
vessel-based)		The underwater noise generated by the vessel's dynamic positioning system is not expected to result in significant impacts including permanent or temporary threshold shift nor behavioural disturbance
Seabed disturbance	Harbour porpoise	No.
	(Phocoena phocoena)	
		The disturbance created by the taking of samples from the seabed is expected to be highly
		localised and unlikely to disrupt prey availability for harbour porpoise. The sedimentary habitats
		in the region are exposed to periodic physical disturbance and the benthic and demersal communities show good recovery to physical disturbance, particularly where this disturbance does not change the sediment composition/type. This will allow for the habitat and prey of harbour porpoise to rapidly recover.

Pressures exerted by	Feature	Is there likely to be a significant effect on the conservation Objectives <u>alone</u>
Activity Dogger Bank SAC		
Underwater noise	1110 Sandbanks which	No.
(impulsive:	are slightly covered by	
geophysical surveys)	seawater all the time	There is no impact pathway for this designated feature from underwater noise.
Underwater noise	1110 Sandbanks which	No.
(non-impulsive:	are slightly covered by	
vessel-based)	seawater all the time	There is no impact pathway for this designated feature from underwater noise.
Seabed disturbance	1110 Sandbanks which	No.
and water-based	are slightly covered by	
muds cuttings	seawater all the time	The operations will cause some temporary physical disturbance of the seabed however this area
		is extremely small being approximately 17.33m ² whereas the sandbank feature within the site
		extends over 12,331km ² . The precise area of seabed disturbance within the Dogger Bank SAC is
		unknown as the survey stations have not been finalised, however a maximum number of 56
		stations will be visited with a total disturbance of 17.33m ² . As this area is very small no attempt
		has been made to discriminate the proportion of this total disturbance that will take place in the
		SAC and the assessed scenario considers all disturbance to occur in the SAC.
		The disturbance will result in some damage to benthic species, however the biological
		assemblages observed in the area will be adapted to natural periodic physical disturbance and
		are likely to show a good degree of resistance, adaptability and recoverability. The small area of
		impact relative to total extent of sandbanks in the site and the high recoverability of the seabed
		means there is no risk of the structure and function of the sandbanks being significantly
		affected. There will also be no change in water flow, no reduction in sediment or nutrient supply
		and no change in sediment composition or type. Thus, there will be no change in the feature's
		supporting processes.

OFFICIAL

Offshore Petroleum Regulator for Environment & Decommissioning

LSE Conclusion: Alone

When considered alone the project is **unlikely to cause a significant effect** on the conservation objectives of any site.

LSE In-combination assessment

Southern North Sea SAC:

NEP

The following projects have been evaluated to ascertain if they could exert a pressure on the SNS SAC's designated feature ("Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)"), which when considered in-combination with those of the proposed operations could result in a significant effect on the site's conservation objectives (Table).

It has been ascertained that these projects, in combination, could exceed the disturbance thresholds identified in the SNCB guidance as being levels beyond which impacts could become significant, namely 20% of the SAC per day and 10% across the relevant season. Therefore, there is potential for significant effects in the SNS SAC.

Project	Activity Type	Significant In- combination effect likely?	What pressures may act in- combination? * See Table for references
Sofia Offshore Windfarm	Monopiling Unabated	Yes.	1
Sofia Offshore Windfarm	Monopiling Abated	Yes	1
East Anglia 3	Monopiling Unabated	Yes	1
East Anglia 3	Monopiling Abated	Yes	1
East Anglia 3	Pin Piling	Yes	1
Hornsea Three	UXO Low Order (x1 pd)	Yes	1
Hornsea Three	UXO Low Order (x2 pd)	Yes	1
Hornsea Three	UXO High Order (x1 pd)	Yes	1
Doggerbank B	Monopiling Unabated	Yes	1
Doggerbank C	Monopiling Unabated	Yes	1
Doggerbank C	Pin Piling	Yes	1
Doggerbank D	Geophysical Survey 1	Yes	1
Doggerbank D	Geophysical Survey 2	Yes	1
National Grid	Geophysical Survey	Yes	1
NEP Expansion	NEP Expansion Seismic (CS007) GS/1867	Yes	1
NEP	Phase 1 2DHR GS/1853	Yes	1

Table 2. Likelihood of plans acting in-combination to cause a likely significant effect for the
SNS SAC. Blue highlighted entry denotes the proposed operations.

Yes

1

EPCI 3 Geophysical -

Offshore Cable GS/1871

Project	Activity Type	Significant In- combination effect likely?	What pressures may act in- combination? * See Table for references
NEP	EPCI 2 Geophysical - Infield GS/1866	Yes	1
NEP	EPCI 1 Geophysical -Pipeline TBC	Yes	1
ENI / Ithaca (Tellus)	Geophysical Surveys	Yes	1
Ithaca (Cynus)	Well Conductor Piling	Yes	1
Norfolk Projects	UXO Clearance Campaign	Yes	1
INEOS UK SNS Ltd	Pegasus West Site & Pipeline Survey	Yes	1

Table 3. Pressure reference - Key of pressures use in in-combination assessment

Pressure	Ref
Underwater noise (impulsive: geophysical survey)	1
Underwater noise (non-impulsive: vessel-based)	2
Seabed disturbance and water-based muds cuttings	3

Dogger Bank SAC:

The total seabed disturbance amounts to 0.0000173 km2 whereas the Dogger Bank SAC extends over 12,331km. This temporary impact is considered of such a small scale that is not possible for it to have any significant or material effect on the conservation objectives of the site as it's proportional contribution, even when considered in-combination with or plans and projects, would be in-consequential.

LSE Conclusion: In-combination

It **cannot** be concluded that the activity is unlikely to cause a significant effect in-combination with other plans or projects on the conservation objectives of the following site:

Site	Feature
Southern North Sea SAC	Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)

It **can** be concluded that the activity is unlikely to cause a significant effect in-combination with other plans or projects on the conservation objectives of the following site:

Site	Feature
Dogger Bank SAC	1110 Sandbanks which are slightly covered by
	seawater all the time)

Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment

Could the activity adversely affect the integrity of a site?

Following the LSE assessment (Stage 1) the SoS must undertake an AA to determine whether the proposed activities, when considered in combination with other plans and projects, could have an adverse effect on:

Site: Southern North Sea SAC

Features: Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)

Pressures: Underwater noise (impulsive: geophysical survey based)

To ensure that the integrity of the SNS SAC is maintained and that it makes the best possible contribution to the Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) for Harbour Porpoise in UK waters, the site has the following objectives:

- 1. Harbour porpoise is a viable component of the site;
- 2. There is no significant disturbance of the species; and
- 3. The condition of supporting habitats and processes, and the availability of prey is maintained.

Note: The objectives are managed in the context of natural change

The 'integrity of the site' is not defined in the Conservation Objectives. However, EU and UK Government guidance defines the integrity of a site as "the coherence of the site's ecological structure and function, across its whole area, or the habitats, complex of habitats and/or populations of species for which the site is or will be classified' (EC 2000, Defra 2012). Therefore, the integrity of the site applies to the whole of the site and it is the potential impacts across the whole of the site that are required to be appropriately assessed. Pressures that would affect site integrity include:

- killing or injuring harbour porpoise (directly or indirectly);
- preventing their use of significant parts of the site (disturbance/displacement);
- significantly damaging relevant habitats; or
- significantly reducing the availability of prey.

The JNCC and Natural England advice is that 'noise disturbance within the site should not exclude harbour porpoise from more than 20% of the site on any given day. Over a season, the advice is that an average loss of access to more than 10% of the SAC should be considered significant, recognising that within the SAC the abundance of harbour porpoise per unit habitat is generally higher than the equivalent sized habitat in the rest of the relevant Management Unit. Management of temporary habitat 'loss' to below defined area/time thresholds is therefore designed to ensure that it continues to contribute in the best possible way to the maintenance of the species at FCS.' (JNCC, 2020).

Appropriate Assessment: Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)

At the LSE assessment stage it was concluded that no significant impact on the designated features of any site will occur when considering the project alone.

AA Conclusion Alone

No adverse effect on site Integrity

In-combination Assessment: Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)

Projects Considered In-combination

The projects listed in Table have the potential to cause cumulative effects on harbour porpoise as they, through the mechanism of noise induced disturbance, have the potential to prevent parts of the site from being used by Harbour porpoise (disturbance/displacement).

Appropriate Assessment

A further assessment has been undertaken to understand whether the impacts from other plans or projects could act in-combination with those of the proposed operations and cause an adverse effect on the site integrity.

Scope of Appropriate Assessment:

Site: Southern North Sea SAC

Features: Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)

Pressures: Underwater noise (impulsive: geophysical survey based)

<u>Conservation Objective 1</u>: Harbour porpoise is a viable component of the site.

Given that the operation only extends over 12 days and is a survey using sub bottom profiler which is not normally considered to represent a significant injury risk, it is considered that the likelihood of killing or injuring harbour porpoise (directly or indirectly) is very low. This likelihood is further reduced using marine mammal mitigation measures which will ensure the absence of marine mammals from the injury area during start up. Injury is not considered further in the appropriate assessment.

Conservation Objective 2: There is no significant disturbance of the species.

- Daily Disturbance

The other projects planned to be emitting impulsive noise into the summer part of the SAC, during summer, are listed in table 5. Also listed in this table are the associated areas of potential displacement associated with each activity based on their respective EDRs.

If all the activities planned for the summer season were to be undertaken on the same day, the cumulative disturbance and subsequent area of displacement would exceed 20% which indicates there is the potential for a significant impact on the conservation objectives if operations progressed without mitigation measures being employed.

- Daily Disturbance – Mitigation

In practice not all operations listed in table 5 will occur on the same day and if activities are instead planned and distributed on days throughout the summer there is sufficient capacity for all the activities listed to proceed without exceeding the 20% level. The operators of all the projects listed in table 5 will therefore have licence conditions which require them to coordinate with other operators. This coordination will ensure that whenever they are emitting impulsive noise they can evidence that the cumulative displacement area for that day will not exceed 20% of the summer area. They will undertake this coordination via the SIMOPs working work group which is part of the Developers Coordination Forum. The cumulative displacement figure for each day will be recorded on the shared noisy activity spreadsheet which is visible to regulators and industry on the DCF Teams channel.

- Seasonal Disturbance

There is some uncertainty regarding what the average seasonal disturbance will be as most licences account for the longest possible period and in practice the operations are often completed in a shorter time frame. Despite uncertainty regard the exact seasonal figure, there is confidence that this figure will be below 10% because even using the worst case scenarios for seasonal disturbance shown in Table 6, the average would be 8.6%. To provide extra security the seasonal average disturbance figure will be calculated and monitored as part of the live cross-sector sim-ops coordination process which is designed to ensure operations remain within the recommended disturbance thresholds.

Table 1: Estimated disturbance to harbour porpoises within the SNS SAC from various activities in isolation using JNCC (2020) EDRs.

Activity	Maxir Dai Disturba the SN	num ily ance to S SAC	Duration of Impact (days)	Average Seasonal Disturbance to the SNS SAC	
	km²	%		(%)	
NEP EPCI 2 SBP Survey	152	0.562	23	0.071	
Sofia OWF Survey	133	0.493	N/A	0	
Sofia OWF Monopiling (Unabated)	1,661	6.147	25	0.840	
East Anglia Three Monopiling (Unabated)	2,122	7.850	7	5.405	
East Anglia Three Monopiling (Abated)	1,19	5.620	176	0.300	
East Anglia Three Pin Piling	705	2.610	21	0.300	
Hornsea Three April Low Order UXO Clearance (1 per day)	78	0.290	8	0.013	
Hornsea Three April Low Order UXO Clearance (2 per day)	157	0.580	8	0.025	
Hornsea Three April High Order UXO Clearance (1 per day)	708	2.620	3	0.043	
Hornsea Three August Low Order UXO Clearance (1 per day)	9	0.035	25	0.005	
Hornsea Three August Low Order UXO Clearance (2 per day)	11	0.039	5	0.001	
Hornsea Three August High Order UXO Clearance (1 per day)	132	0.490	20	0.054	
Dogger Bank B Monopiling (Unabated)	2,865	10.60	1	0.058	
Dogger Bank C Monopiling (Unabated)	6	0.024	4	0.001	

NEP Phase 1 Seismic Survey	526	1.946	20	0.213
NEP Expansion Seismic Survey CS025	1,473	5.450	18	0.536
NEP Expansion Seismic Survey CS007	744	2.753	33	0.496
NEP EPCI 1 Survey	121	0.448	10	0.024
NEP EPCI 3 Survey	121	0.448	19	0.046
INEOS Pegasus West	471	1.75	12	0.11
Ithaca Cygnus Conductor Piling	706	2.62	1	0.01
Total				8.551

In terms of daily disturbance, other impulsive noise-generating operations may take place concurrently with the proposed operations. Currently the cumulative daily totals for the provisional survey dates are shown in table 6. For these provisional dates there are currently no days where the daily 20% level could be exceeded however these numbers remain provisional and will be managed by the SIMOPS group.

Table 2: Worst case daily disturbance scenario

Tot	al Daily:	17.95	17.95	17.95	17.66	15.71	15.71	15.71	15.71	15.71	15.71	15.71	15.14
Project	Activity Type												
Sofia Offshore													
Windfar	Monopiling												
m	Unabated	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13
East	Monopiling												
Anglia 3	Abated	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.62
Hornsea	UXO Low												
Three	Order (x1 pd)	0.29	0.29	0.29									
NEP	Phase 1 2DHR GS/1853	1 95	1 95	1 95	1 95								
NEP	EPCI 3 Geophysical	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.55								
	- Offshore Cable GS/1871	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64
NEP	EPCI 2 Geophysical - Infield												
	GS/1866	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	
	Pegasus West Site & Pipeline												
Ltd	Survey	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75

<u>Conservation Objective 3</u>: The condition of supporting habitats and processes and the availability of prey is maintained

There is no impact pathway whereby impulsive noise could result in significant impacts to the relevant habitats in a way that could reduce the availability of prey

The developer has undertaken an assessment of the potential impact from impulsive noise on fish and the risk of significant injury or displacement in fish populations was shown to be low. Therefore, the risk of significant impacts to prey availability or supporting habitats is low and is not considered further in the appropriate assessment.

Conclusion: Impact In-combination						
Pressure	Feature	ls an adverse effect possible				
Underwater noise (impulsive: geophysical survey)	Harbour porpoise (<i>Phocoena phocoena</i>)	No, provided the mitigation measures outlined are employed.				

Conclusion of Habitats Regulations Assessment

An assessment has been undertaken to determine whether the geophysical survey at Pegasus West by INEOS could significantly impact the conservation objectives of any site within the UK National Site Network. The likelihood of a significant effect on the conservation objectives of the following site and features could not be ruled out:

Southern North Sea SAC – Harbour porpoise (Phocoena phocoena)

An appropriate assessment was undertaken to ascertain whether the project could adversely affect the site's integrity considering its conservation objectives:

Conservation Objectives:

- 1. Harbour porpoise is a viable component of the site;
- 2. There is no significant disturbance of the species; and
- 3. The condition of supporting habitats and processes, and the availability of prey is maintained.

The appropriate assessment has determined that the project will have some effect on the SAC and without mitigation there is the potential for adverse effects on harbour porpoise when impacts from other plans and projects are considered in-combination. However, the SNS SAC Developers Coordination Forum provides a coordinated approach whereby the permits and consents issued to operators include conditions limiting cumulative displacement/disturbance

to 20% of the summer area. If it is estimated that the thresholds are to be exceeded, then no work can be undertaken. INEOS are part of this forum and have committed to participating and coordinating with other operators to meet the forum's goal.

The Secretary of State, therefore, concludes that the proposed project will not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects.

Annex

Application documents

SA/2095 GS/1886/0

Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) Consultation

Consultation Response Received 08/04/2025

SNCB	Comments	Response
JNCC	Agree with conclusions of the	
	Appropriate assessment	

References

JNCC (2017). Statutory nature conservation agency protocol for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from geophysical surveys.

JNCC (2020). Guidance for assessing the significance of noise disturbance against Conservation Objectives of harbour porpoise SACs.

OFFICIAL