**Planning Criteria Offshore Renewable Energy – Update 16th of April 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Energy | Belgium | Denmark | Germany | Netherlands | Norway | Scotland | Sweden |
| MSP’s role in locating OWE | MSP is used to designate spatial areas for renewable energy and for offshore wind, the wind turbine area | Until now sectoral decision-making and planning by the Danish Energy Agency. MSP’s role is to coordinate use of the sea areas for different uses.  | Designation of priority areas is indicative.OWF can be built outside the designated areas. | MSP is used to designate wind energy areas and all the conditions required to build wind farms (location, permit and grid connection etc.) | No zones have been opened for OWE yet but 15 possible or suitable areas have been identified by SEA | MSP particularly focuses on the development of the marine renewableenergy sector MSP is used to identify spatial ‘Plan Options’ for offshore wind, tidal and wave energy.  | National interest areas from energy authority taken into MSP plan, but MSP suggest also new areas. OWE can be built outside the designated areas. |
| OWE distance from the shore | 12 NM | Smaller OWF located between 4 and 20 km Large OWF are located > 15 km distance | Not defined, but visibility and the National Park has been a reason why far from the coastline. Hub height limited to 125m if visible from coast | Current OWF 6-34 NM off the coast. All new designated OWF areas are at least 10 NM out of the coast.  | Not defined, there are is currently no OWE  | No minimum distance set, plan options can be within and out with 12NM (cut-off point for devolved powers) | Not defined (case by case) |
| MSP linked to permit procedure | MSP shows wind turbine area |  | Shows suitable areas in EEZ.Indicative designation of suitable areas in EEZ.Permissions outside designated areas possible | Wind farm site decisions are based on MSP designated areas. Wind farms are not permitted to be built outside these designated areas.  | No zones opened yet therefore there is no existing practice on licensing for commercial OWE projects | MSP identifies spatial Plan Options. Seabed lease and marine licensing applications are expected to be located within the Plan Options. Applications within Plan Options are not guaranteed to obtain a licence.Scotland’s National Marine Plan provides the framework for the licensing and consents process | MSP has a guiding influence, municipalities have a veto right.  |
| Initiative from the operators or from the authorities/planning process? | The authorities define the area, the operators develop the windfarm layout |  | Until now initiatives from the operators. New scheme for OWF installations from 2021: designation of OWF areas by authorities. Preliminary assessment included  | The State is responsible for designating offshore wind farm areas.  |  | Initiatives from the planning authorities (sectoral planning) | Initiatives come from the operators  |
| Use of planning criteria | Set of criteria has been developed by the authorities and stakeholders together | Set of criteria has been used by the energy authority | Technical and spatial planning criteria defined for the indication of OWF areas and development | Set of criteria being used – design and technical criteria | Set of criteria used to identify zones | Spatial and technical planning criteria used by the planning authority to show ‘Plan Options’ for offshore marine renewable energy | Has an indicative list, but always case by case |
| Existing OWF  | 6 offshore wind farms (182 turbines) | 13 offshore wind parks (516 turbines)3 under preparations  | 18 (North Sea):EEZ (942 turbines – 4495 MW) 6 OWF in construction9 under preparation(11/2018)  | 5 OWF ( 957 MW) + 10 areas designated for OWFSee offshore wind energy roadmap 2030. www.noordzeeloket.nl/en | 1 turbine | 12 bottom-fixed foundation OWFs and 3 floating OWFs have been granted consent | 577 turbines, 7 OWF approved + several projects in preparation |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Similarities | Differences | Actions |
| * MSP process has at least started
* Most countries have designated OWF areas
* No minimum distances from shore was applied so far
* Strong influence of MSP on OWF licensing
 | * No one size fits all -> different legislation, planning &maturity level
* Different levels of exclusivity, incl. Fishing, MPAs, shipping (e.g. Sweden and Germany)
* Technical layers per country differ -> bathymetry, visual impact, Natura 2000)
* Licensing duration & process differ
* OWF initiative differs: top-down, bottom-up and unknowns
* Planning criteria themselves of different origins, nature & weighting
 | * Awareness where other countries are in the process
* Tools can help: timeline, living Q
* Communicate differences better
* Harmonisation of transnational EU level regulation
* Interpretation -> Natura 2000, SEA, HRA, (it´s a framework)
* Make distinction between developer and operator
 |