



Application by Navitus Bay Development Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Navitus Bay Wind Park

Agendas for issue-specific hearings

This document sets out agendas for issue-specific hearings.

Participation in hearings

All interested parties can attend the hearings.

Each interested party is entitled to make oral representations at the hearings. However, this is subject to the Examining Authority's power to control the hearings. The attendees listed under specific topics are invited because the Examining Authority considers that the material they have submitted raises issues that the Examining Authority would like to explore at the hearings.

Conduct of the hearings

Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 and the Examination Procedure Rules provide that at hearings it is the Examining Authority that will probe, test and assess the evidence through direct questioning of persons making oral representations. Questioning at the hearings will therefore be led by a member of the Panel, supported by other Panel members.

Cross examination of the person giving evidence by another person will only be permitted if the Examining Authority decides it is necessary to ensure representations are adequately tested or that a person has had a fair chance to put their case. For most matters the Examining Authority will conduct the hearing in a round table format.

The Examining Authority, however, considers that cross examination may be appropriate in relation to certain matters concerning offshore and onshore landscape and visual impacts, noise and socio-economic/tourism topics. Accordingly, under Rule 14(5) of the Examination Procedure Rules, attendees listed under that topic will be invited to question the applicant and the applicant will similarly be invited to question those attendees. Arrangements for the oral questioning will be explained on the day.

The applicant, statutory nature conservation bodies, local authorities and other bodies seeking to present and rely on expert evidence are advised to ensure that their appropriate expert advisors are present on each day of the hearings and available to give evidence and to be questioned. All relevant experts should be available to be brought to the hearings at short notice, to ensure efficient management of the process.

A hard copy of the application documents will be available in the hearing room.

The time allocated for each of the issue-specific hearings is estimated, based on the matters identified for consideration. The Examining Authority may at any time shorten or lengthen a session, conclude a hearing early, continue on one of the rollover days of 21 or 28 November 2014 or otherwise adjust the timings as required for each issue to be examined to their satisfaction.

HEARING ON THE SPECIFIC ISSUES

Date: Tuesday 18 November 2014 continuing on Wednesday 19, Thursday 20, Friday 21 November 2014 (if necessary).

Venue:

Bournemouth Highcliff Marriott Hotel
Dorchester Suite
St Michael's Road
West Cliff
Bournemouth
BH2 5DU.

Time: Doors open at 9.00am.

Business commences at 10.00 am on all hearing days. Breaks will be taken during the hearing as directed from the Chair at convenient times, including at approximately 1pm for an hour each day.

Day 1 – Tuesday 18 November AM

- 1. Welcome, introduction and explanation of procedure at the hearing**
- 2. Examining Authority questions to applicant relating to the principle of the turbine area mitigation option.**
 - The purpose of the mitigation option.
 - Extent of additional information to be provided by the applicant.
 - Consultation arrangements.
- 3. Marine and coastal physical processes: sediments dynamics, waste and debris**

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Natural England

- Marine Management Organisation
- Environment Agency
- Borough of Poole
- Dorset County Council
- Challenge Navitus
- Poole and Christchurch Bays' Association
- Gaye Napier
- John Sharpe
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
- Dorset Wildlife Trust

3.1 Implications of the turbine area mitigation option (5 November 2014) and predicted effects if the option were to be adopted.

3.2 Issues relating to cable installation offshore:

- Agree the extent of scour protection and cable protection.
- The need for further assessment and consultation on scour protection requirements in chalk, if burying is not possible.
- Status of the Clarification Note being discussed between the applicant and Natural England.
- The Assessment of Cable Burial Methods chart indicates two options within the western corridor, with no options for the eastern. Is the eastern corridor still being considered?

3.3 Worst case scenarios for suspended sediment concentration:

- Agree realistic worst case for cable installation.
- Should the worst case scenario be secured in the DCO/DML?
- Agree worst case for sediment plumes from installation of the meteorological mast.

3.4 Possible presence of Annex 1 reefs

3.5 Sediment transfer and beach replenishment impacts along the Poole coastline.

3.6 As Navitus OWF as a disposal site is agreed, should acceptability of the types and quantities of material for disposal be agreed? Possible disruption agreements with:

- Charter boats used for angling
- Diving organisations

3.7 Issues relating to cable installation onshore

- Accuracy of the geological assessment at Taddiford Gap, Golden Hill, railway crossing and Bashley Cross.
- Establishing stability of the cliffs at Taddiford Gap and the effects of climate change.

3.8 Relevant DCO/DML requirements.

4. Commercial fisheries

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Southern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority
- Marine Management Organisation
- National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
- Poole and Dorset Fishermen's Association

- 4.1 Implications of the turbine area mitigation option of 5 November 2014.
- 4.2 Progress on the Fisheries Engagement Plan and Coexistence Plan. Establishment of a Working Group of representatives.
- 4.3 Issues surrounding cable laying and potential interference with fishing. Progress on Cable specification and installation plan.
- 4.4 Resolution of landing data with MMO
- 4.5 Relevant DCO/DML requirements.

5. Air quality, water quality and drainage (impacts on humans)

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Borough of Poole
- Bournemouth Borough Council
- Challenge Navitus
- Christchurch District Council
- Dorset County Council
- East Dorset District Council
- Environment Agency
- Hampshire County Council
- Marine Maritime Organisation
- New Forest District Council
- Poole and Christchurch Bays Association

5.1 Air quality

- Impacts from fog being caused in the lee of the turbines.
- Impacts from turbines affecting climatic conditions, including coastal air temperatures.
- Dust emissions during construction.

- Impact of construction traffic movements on nitrogen dioxide concentrations within the Lyndhurst AQMA mentioned by New Forest District Council in their Local Impact Report.
- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

5.2 Offshore water quality

- Impacts on blue flag beaches.
- Impacts of pollution arising from minor collisions and allisions.
- Consideration of recent trends in ship regulation, including the phasing out of single-hull tankers and requirements for void-spaces around tanks.
- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

5.3 Onshore water quality

- Assessment of the risk of bentonite breakout, impact and mitigation.
- The need for DCO Requirement 22 to include monitoring regimes to assess the impact of construction works on the environment with particular regard to watercourse crossings.
- The need for, and approval of, detailed method statements for each crossing.
- Does DCO Requirement 25(1) need to be amended to reflect that it is the lead planning authority, rather than the Local Lead Flood Authority, that will approve the scheme and programme for water crossing works?
- The need for an auditing process to ensure that the Best Practical Means described within the Management of Environmental Issue section of the Code of Construction Practice are delivered on site.
- Measures to address known or suspected contamination, including landfill sites.
- Is New Forest District Council satisfied that the proposals in Section 4.8 of the Code of Construction Practice are sufficient to mitigate sediment being transported into sensitive areas?
- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Other relevant DCO requirements.

5.4 Drainage

- Consents required for discharge into drainage systems.
- Impacts and approval of additional drainage measures to prevent water logging of the cable trench and surrounding area after installation of the cable ducts.
- Inclusion of requirements for detailed surface water management schemes for the onshore substation site in the DCO.

- Evidence that Flood Defence Consents and Land Drainage Consents and other consents and licenses required under other legislation listed in Document 5.5 will be obtained.
- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Other relevant DCO requirements.

5.5 Flood risk

- Can the Local Flood Authorities and the Environment Agency confirm that sequential and exception tests are not required?
- Are the Local Flood Authorities and the Environment Agency satisfied that impacts from construction on flood risks for Flood Zones 2 and 3 can be mitigated through implementation of measures in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)?
- Does the DCO need to be amended to reflect that approval in writing for Flood Defence Consent is required from the Environment Agency for Main River crossings and approval in writing for Land Drainage Consent is required from the Local Lead Flood Authority for Ordinary Watercourse crossings.
- Impacts of the onshore works on the operation of the Milford Dam. The need for a detailed agreed method of construction for works in the vicinity of the Milford Dam.
- Evidence that Flood Defence Consents will be obtained.
- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Other relevant DCO requirements.

5.6 Management and control plans and other consents and licenses

- Timing of finalisation of Code of Construction Practice and identification of discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Requirements and timing of other relevant management and control plans, including the Construction Environmental Management Plan, Project Environmental Management Plan, Environmental Incident Control Plan, Soils and Land Use Management Plan, Water and Sediment Management Plan, Contaminated Land Management Plan, Air Quality Management Plan and Marine Pollution Contingency Plan.
- Identification of discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Evidence that other relevant consents and licenses required under other legislation listed in Document 5.5 will be obtained.

Tuesday 18 November PM

6. Noise, vibration and electromagnetic field (EMF) (impacts on humans)

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Bournemouth Borough Council

- Challenge Navitus
- Christchurch District Council
- East Dorset District Council
- Environment Agency
- Isle of Wight Council
- Marine Maritime Organisation
- New Forest District Council
- Poole and Christchurch Bays Association

6.1 Vibration

- Onshore vibration during construction, including excavation, hydraulic breaking and HGV movements.
- Requirements for ground investigation and sensitivity to actual ground conditions.
- The need for monitoring.
- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Relevant DCO requirements.

6.2 EMF

- EMF associated with offshore and onshore cables.
- Assumptions used in the assessment of impacts, including depth of burial, geology, shielding, cable specification, voltage, phase current and scouring protection.
- Can the Applicant confirm that it will comply with ICNIRP guidelines relevant to magnetic fields caused by underground cables by ensuring that the 100 microtesla reference level for public exposure to magnetic fields is not exceeded?
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

6.3 Noise arising from onshore

6.3.1 Construction

- Construction noise, including Horizontal Direct Drilling (HDD) or other trenchless techniques.
- Noise associated with the onshore substation, temporary compounds and HGV movements.
- Noise limits to BS5228:2009-1 Appendix E3.2 category A or category B?
- Proposed mitigation including hours/days of work, Best Practicable Means working methods, acoustic screening, monitoring and complaints procedures.
- Restriction of construction activities that have the potential to cause annoyance/nuisance for residential properties in very close proximity to the cable corridor, including a property in Hare Lane mentioned by New Forest District Council in their Local Impact Report.

- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Relevant DCO requirements.

6.3.2 Operation and maintenance

- Operational noise at the onshore substation.
- Proposed mitigation including noise reduction using enclosures and monitoring.
- Provisions in the Operational Noise Management Plan and other relevant plans.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

6.3.3 Decommissioning

- Requirements and timing of the Onshore Decommissioning Plan. Identify discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Relevant DCO requirements.

6.4 Noise arising from offshore

6.4.1 Construction

- Implications of turbine area mitigation option of 5 November 2014.
- Construction noise, including piling.
- Noise limits to BS5228:2009-1 Appendix E3.2 category A or category B?
- Calculation of noise levels, including allowances for meteorological conditions and cylindrical spreading and allowances for the impulsive and repetitive characteristics of piling noise.
- Impact on divers.
- Proposed mitigation including hours/days of work, limits on number of concurrent piling operations, monitoring and complaints procedures.
- Could the applicant explain the reasoning for monopile foundations not being used in the mitigation option?
- Provisions in the Code of Construction Practice.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

6.4.2 Operation and maintenance

- Implications of turbine area mitigation option of 5 November 2014.
- Daytime and night-time noise limits to ETSU-R-97 and the use of the simplified procedure.
- Calculation of noise levels, including allowances for meteorological conditions, distance used for transition from spherical to cylindrical spreading and the applicability of attenuation at the coast to cliff-top properties.
- Operational noise contours incorporating cylindrical spreading.
- Alternative calculations presented by Poole and Christchurch Bays Association.

- Proposed mitigation including hours/days of work, limits on number of concurrent piling operations and monitoring.
- The need for complaints procedures.
- The need to monitor Amplitude Modulation.
- Provisions in the Operational Noise Management Plan and other relevant plans.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

6.5 Decommissioning

- Provisions in the Offshore Decommissioning Plan.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

6.6 Other noise

- The need for background noise surveys, including consideration of the requirements of National Policy Statement EN1 paragraph 5.11.4.

6.7 Management and control plans and other consents and licenses

- Timing of completion of Code of Construction Practice, Operational Noise Management Plan and Decommissioning Plans.
- Identification of discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Requirements of other relevant management and control plans, including the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Project Environmental Management Plan.
- Timing of completion of the plans.
- Identification of discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Evidence that other relevant consents and licenses required under other legislation listed in Document 5.5 will be obtained.

Day 2 – Wednesday 19 November AM/PM

Invited attendees

1. Welcome, introduction and explanation of procedure at the hearing

2. Biodiversity, biological environment and ecology offshore

Invited attendees

- Applicant
- Marine Management Organisation
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- RSPB
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
- Dorset Wildlife Trust
- Hampshire Ornithological Society
- Dorset Bird Club
- Christchurch Harbour Ornithological Group

- Mr Peter Fenning
 - East Dorset District Council
 - Christchurch Borough Council
 - Dorset County Council
 - Hurn Parish Council
 - Challenge Navitus
- 2.1 Implications of the turbine area mitigation option (5 November 2014) and predicted effects if the option were to be adopted.
- 2.2 Clarification on the assessment of the physical nature of the seabed and currents.
- 2.3 Clarification regarding the locations of areas of geogenic reef and the need to ensure general biodiversity duty of the NERC Act.
- 2.4 What methods were used for the statistical ecological analysis for marine biodiversity?
- 2.5 Clarification of the need, or not, to include in the DML restrictions to ploughing and jetting in inland waters for the protection of sensitive fish species.
- 2.6 Piling
- Piling restrictions to protect adult Atlantic Salmon
 - Confirmation that piling restrictions will protect seahorses and black bream
 - How long will the build-up period be for soft start?
- 2.7 Post construction monitoring requirements related to cable installation.
- 2.8 What stage is the in-principle monitoring plan at and what does it cover?
- 2.9 Harbour porpoise and bottlenose dolphin cumulative impacts, EPS licences, Letters of No Impediment.
- 2.10 Collision risk for seals
- If a French construction port is chosen how will the collision risk for seals be addressed?
 - Do Natural England consider that they should be consulted on vessel routing protocols to minimise collision risks?
- 2.11 The need for ornithological monitoring to compare actual situation against predictions
- 2.12 Collision risk modelling
- Can Natural England explain their scoping out criteria, and does this include consultations with local organisations?
 - Would Marine Scotland Science revised Avoidance Rates impact on significance?
 - What are the views of invited IPs on the additional information supplied by the applicant on 2 October 2014 regarding estimation of numbers for bird species?
- 2.13 Relevant DCO/DML requirements

3. Biodiversity, biological environment and ecology onshore

- 3.1 Does the fact that stretches of the Onshore Development Area were not accessible during original surveys impact on the screening process, for example for Great Crested Newts?
- 3.2 Are there deficiencies in the assessment of effects on EU species like otter, dormouse, bats?
- 3.3 Cable trenching
 - Does the cable laying process result in no net loss of biodiversity?
 - Can the applicant confirm that open trenching works at watercourse crossings will be limited to 20m whilst within the channel?
 - Restrictions for open cut river crossings to avoid salmonoid migrating and spawning
 - Can the applicant confirm that trenchless crossing of Dorset Heathlands SPA includes Dorset Heath SAC?
 - If site investigations confirm that HDD is not suitable at any of the identified locations, what methodology is proposed instead? Would further assessment be required under the Habitats Regulations?
 - Can the applicant define 'significant trees' in relation to loss of trees in the cable corridor? Do these include trees which are not subject to TPO?
 - Will statutory undertakers accept shallow rooted trees being planted over the cable?
- 3.4 Hurn Forest
 - Is it relevant to consider the impacts on habitats and species in Hurn Forest as a whole in addition to the St Leonards and St Ives SSSI? Currently the proposal for HDD is for about 1/3rd of the length of trench through the Forest
- 3.5 What arrangements are being made to control invasive weeds during and post construction?
- 3.6 What is the latest position regarding discussions about cumulative impacts from the St Leonards Hospital residential development planning application
- 3.7 What proposals are being made for surface water management for the substation?
- 3.8 What are the arrangements for the management of users away from the sensitive habitats, including monitoring of these areas?
- 3.9 Do the affected local authorities agree that methods to mitigate potential contamination of surface and ground water are described in the Code of Construction Practice are suitable?
- 3.10 Will the storage requirements and approval of requirements for drilling fluids be included in the CEMP?
- 3.11 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)
 - Do IPs consider the draft LEMP to be sufficient?

- Is the time period for the plan sufficient to allow for thinning of woodland planting and ensure a satisfactory structure is achieved?
- 3.12 When will the Environment Agency be in a position to issue a letter of no impediment for sand lizards?
- 3.13 Onshore lighting impacts during construction and operation on birds
- 3.14 Will the s106 agreement for scrub clearance, etc secure habitat creation to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands SPA?
- 3.15 Will the biodiversity offset fund be available for bodies other than local biodiversity partnerships?
- 3.16 In combination impacts
- Approach to in combination impacts for gannets, kittiwake, Mediterranean gull. Including request from RSPB for the applicant to undertaken population viability analysis
 - Can the applicant provide in-combination mortality for Flamborough pSPA and SPA?
 - Is it possible to rule out significant impacts from the Application on the gannet population of the Alderney West Coast and the Burhou Islands Ramsar site, due to collision risk and displacement, alone and in combination?
- 3.17 Are further details necessary for measures to avoid in combination piling impacts with Rampion?
- 3.18 Relevant DCO/DML requirements.

Day 3 – Thursday 20 November AM

- 1. Welcome, introduction and explanation of procedure at the hearing**
- 2. Highways/traffic/transportation**

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
 - Highways Agency
 - Dorset County Council
 - Hampshire County Council
 - Milford on sea Parish Council
 - Milton Town Council
 - Hurn Parish Council
- 2.1 The Highways Agency requires additional measures to be included in the draft Construction Traffic Plan. Have these been agreed?
- 2.2 Has the preliminary design and corresponding NMU Audit and Stage 1 Safety Audit been approved by the Highways Authority?
- 2.3 Milford on Sea PC and Milton TC have raised issues concerning traffic. Have these been resolved?
- 2.4 The use of Pitthouse Lane for access to the cable route is disputed by Hurn PC and an alternative suggested. What is the applicant's response and how might the PC's concerns be mitigated?

2.5 Relevant DCO requirements.

3. Operational and navigational safety

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Maritime and Coastguard Agency
- Crown Estates
- Trinity House
- UK Chamber of Shipping
- Royal Yachting Association
- Royal Yachting Squadron
- Christchurch sailing Club
- Cruising Association

3.1 The predicted effects to navigation arising from the turbine area mitigation option.

3.2 The UK Chamber of Shipping raises a number of concerns relating to safety risks, bad weather routings, and future risk assessment. How have these issues been taken into account?

3.3 The Cruising Association has proposed a 1nm buffer zone on the NW boundary of the site to allow for safer navigation. Has NBDL considered these proposals?

3.4 A number of organisations have expressed concern about the impact of the wind farm on cross channel recreational vessels. Is the applicant able to mitigate these anticipated impacts?

Thursday 20 November PM

4. DCO and DML provisions arising from topics discussed

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Marine Management Organisation
- Local Authorities
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Maritime and Coastguard Agency
- Crown Estates
- Royal Yachting Association

4.1 Conditions relating to;

- Pre-Construction Plans and Documentation
- Pre-Construction Monitoring and Surveys
- Construction and Monitoring programme
- Aids to navigation

- Piling energy
 - Design principles
- 4.2 Articles relating to;
- Benefit of Order
 - Transfer of benefits
 - Crown rights
- 4.3 Requirements relating to;
- Public rights of way
 - Flood risk scheme
 - Code of Construction Practice
 - Construction Environment Management Plan
 - Soils and Land Use Management Plan
 - Ecological Management Plan
 - Construction hours
 - Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
 - Water and Sediment Plan
 - Watercourse crossings
 - External lighting
 - EA legal easement
 - Design Guide
- 4.4 Other matters
- S106 monitoring requirement costs
 - S106 - contents and progress
 - Definition of 25 years
 - Monitoring of construction information sharing
 - Offshore works construction hours
 - Offshore works time of year restrictions related to peak bathing
 - Emergency Response and Cooperation Plan

Day 4 – Friday 21 November (If required)

- 1. Welcome and Introduction**
- 2. Miscellaneous matters or rollover from previous sessions**

Date : Tuesday 25 November, continuing Wednesday 26, Thursday 27 November and Friday 28 November (if necessary)

Venue:

Wessex Hotel
West Cliff Road
Bournemouth
BH2 5EU

Time: Registration commences at 9.00am.

Business commences at 10am on all hearing days. Breaks will be taken during the hearing as directed from the Chair at convenient times, including at approximately 1pm for an hour each day.

Day 1 – Tuesday 25 November AM/PM

- 1. Welcome, introduction and explanation of procedure**
- 2. Offshore seascape, landscape and visual impacts**

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Dorset County Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Dorset AONB team
- Isle of Wight AONB Partnership
- Bournemouth Borough Council
- New Forest National Park Authority
- Borough of Poole
- Purbeck District Council
- Natural England
- National Trust
- Challenge Navitus
- Poole and Christchurch Bays Association

- 2.1 Why has the applicant chosen not to follow the OESEA2 recommendation to site the "*...bulk of this new generation capacity away from the coast, generally outside 12 nautical miles (22km)*"?

2.2 Implications of the turbine area mitigation option for the SLVI assessment. What changes are predicted to the significance of effects on the seascape, landscape, visual receptors, on designated landscapes and coasts?

2.3 On the basis of material available to date in connection with the mitigation option, can the attendees confirm their respective position with regard to the SLVIA?

2.4 Assessment methodology

- Visual representations – the accuracy and use for purposes of seascape, landscape and visual assessments of the visualisations: 1) prepared by the applicant, and 2) prepared by Challenge Navitus.
- Do the applicant’s visualisations offer a fair and reasonable basis for aiding judgements as to the potential visual effects of the proposed development and are sufficient for decision-making purposes?
- Would further visualisations prepared in accordance with SNH 2014 alter the overall assessments?
- The extent to which the SLVIA accords with industry good practice, in particular GLVIA3 and the adoption of threshold of significance.
- If the threshold of ‘significant effect’ were triggered by a ‘moderate’ assessment would this: 1) necessitate changes to the overall assessment, and 2) alter the weight to be accorded to impacts on seascape, landscape and visual receptors and to the integrity of designated landscapes?
- The approach to identifying seascape baselines.
- Identifying the key differences between the applicant and IPs on significance of effects and principal reasons for those differences.

Detailed consideration of the SLVIA

2.4.1 Applicant/IoW AONB Partnership/Dorset County Council/Bournemouth Borough Council/National Trust :

- The SLVIA’s interpretation of the DTI Guidance in assessing sensitivity of RSUs, and the way that the approach influenced conclusions on significance of effects.
- Whether a fine-grained approach should have been used to assess impacts on Seascape Character Types and Landscape Character Types.
- As a principle, the level of sensitivity to be accorded to residents, users of public highways and coastal paths.
- Why does the assessment on the Isle of Wight AONB focus on Area A alone, given that the ZTV shows that the turbine area would be visible from other areas of the AONB?
- Whether, in the light of the material submitted to date, there is scope for narrowing differences between the parties on impacts on the AONB, Heritage Coast, landscape or visual receptors.

2.4.2 Applicant/Natural England/Dorset AONB Team/Dorset County Council/Hampshire County Council/National Trust

- The principle of recording 'significant' impact where a sequence of 'moderate' visual impacts are predicted along coastal trails.
- Categorising sensitivity of visual receptors at coastal trails.
- The approach in Natural England's written representation to assessing the effects of offshore development on Dorset and Isle of Wight AONBs as a whole is through the consideration of impacts on their component parts: special qualities, seascape character, landscape character of the coastal parts of the AONB, visual receptors and night time impacts. Is this a credible approach to adopt in providing an overview of the impact that the offshore element of the development would have on the integrity of the AONBs?
- Could the same method be applied to the National Park and Heritage Coasts?
- Whether, in the light of the material submitted to date there is scope for narrowing differences between the parties on impacts on the AONB, Heritage Coast, landscape or visual receptors.

2.5 The scope for mitigation and/or compensation of offshore impacts and the means of securing them.

2.6 Relevant DCO/DML requirements.

3. Onshore landscape and visual impacts

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- Hurn Parish Council
- New Forest National Park Authority
- East Dorset District Council
- New Forest District Council
- Dorset County Council
- Hampshire County Council
- New Milton Town Council

3.1 National Parks (and AONB) are accorded the highest status of protection. To what extent has the project been assessed to establish:

- the need for the development;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated National Park, and
- detrimental effects and scope for moderation.

3.2 Possibility of trenchless crossings at additional locations – Hurn Forest, Neacroft Bog, Allensworth Wood, Hinton Park.

- 3.3 Justification for the width of cable trenching required. Could this be reduced to minimise impacts and loss of biodiversity?
- 3.4 With the turbine area mitigation option in place, what are the landscape and visual implications of the onshore cabling works, in particular the predicted loss of trees/hedgerows/heathland?
- 3.5 Likely duration of the construction compounds, their impact on residents and on visual and landscape receptors. Should the DCO secure control over temporary means of enclosure, boundary treatments, extent of the compounds and sound attenuation measures.
- 3.6 Appropriateness of the LEMP. Timing, discharge and consultation with relevant bodies.
- 3.7 Compensation or mitigation measures proposed and the means of securing them.
- 3.8 Relevant DCO requirements.

Tuesday, 25 November PM

4. Offshore and onshore archaeology

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- English Heritage

- 4.1 Does Condition 11(h) adequately secure the mitigation measures recorded in Table 14.19 of ES Volume B Chapter 14 – Offshore Archaeology?
- 4.2 Request by English Heritage to modify Conditions 11 and 12. Is this justified?
- 4.3 Should English Heritage be a named consultee alongside MMO and Natural England under Condition 15(3).
- 4.4 New Forest NPA refers to geo-arch deposit model not being covered in the WSI. Furthermore, the SoCG with Local Authorities indicates that Optically Stimulated Luminescence dating techniques would be deployed during the construction phase if the opportunity arises. What measures can the applicant provide to ensure that these and possibly other requirements would be included in the WSI?
- 4.5 Relevant DCO requirements.

5. Other heritage assets

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
- English Heritage
- Friends of Durlston Executive Committee
- New Forest National Park Authority

- Purbeck District Council
 - Bournemouth Borough Council
 - Borough of Poole
 - Dorset County Council
 - Meyrick Estates
- 5.1 The extent to which open sea views contribute to the setting and significance of the following designated heritage assets:
- Lower Needles Battery
 - Hurst Castle
 - Durlston Castle
 - St Aldhelm's Chapel
 - Clavell Tower
 - Anvil Point Lighthouse
 - Keyhaven Conservation Area (with reference to the Conservation Area character appraisal)
- 5.2 To explore with the applicant, local authorities and the Friends of Durlston Executive Committee whether the level of harm resulting from introduction of the turbine area into the seascape would be substantial or less than substantial. (Durlston Castle including night time impact, Clavell Tower, Anvil Point Lighthouse and Keyhaven Conservation Area only).
- 5.3 To what extent would the turbine area mitigation option alter assessments of the predicted impact on the settings of the above listed heritage assets?
- 5.4 The impact on Hinton Admiral House and Gardens from onshore cabling works.
- 5.5 Relevant DCO/DML requirements.

Day 2 – Wednesday 26 November AM

- 1. Welcome, introduction and explanation of procedure**
- 2. World Heritage Site (WHS)**

Invited attendees:

- Applicant
 - Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site Steering Group
 - Dorset County Council
 - Jurassic Coast Trust
 - Purbeck District Council
 - Natural England
 - Prof Brunsdon
 - Challenge Navitus
 - Poole and Christchurch Bays Association
- 2.1 Agree the broad policy framework in respect of NPS EN-1, NPS EN-3, NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance and the Barnwell Manor judgement.

- 2.2 IUCN comments accompanying the 2 May 2014 letter to DCMS claims that, in adopting the ICOMOS guidance, the 8 assessment principles in the IUCN guidance have not been adhered to. The question is whether the methodologies used by the applicant to assess the impact of the proposed development on the WHS broadly reflect appropriate guidance requirements for Environmental Assessments of sites.
- 2.3 The extent to which the project would affect the 3 components of the site's Outstanding Universal Value:
- the values of the site and the criteria for which the site was designated;
 - its integrity;
 - the protection and management intended to ensure that the site's values and conditions of integrity at the time of inscription are maintained and enhanced in the future.
- 2.4 The impact on the setting of the WHS and the extent to which that impact would affect the property's significance. This issue also raises the prospect of considering the mitigation option for the turbine area, and the consequential implications for effect on setting/significance.
- 2.5 The scope for other mitigation measures to reduce or offset impact of the development on the WHS.
- 2.6 The prospect of deletion of the site from the World Heritage list.
- 2.7 In the light of the above whether the development would undermine the State's duties under Article 4 of the convention to ensure protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the natural heritage of this WHS.

3. DESIGN

Invited attendees:

- Attendees
 - Applicant
 - Dorset County Council
 - New Forest National Park Authority
 - Jurassic Coast Steering Group
 - Natural England
 - East Dorset District Council
 - Isle of Wight Council
- 3.1 Does Condition 11 (a) of the DML provide adequate control over the scale and layout of the turbine array and offshore substations to minimise visual impacts, in particular views from the National Park, AONBs and Heritage Coasts.

- 3.2 Should the design of the turbines and offshore substations be the subject of design principles requiring consultation with local authorities and approval of the MMO?
- 3.3 To what extent has the applicant explored the possibility of directing the cable route and locating the substation outside the Green Belt.
- 3.4 DCO Requirement 10(2) expects details of the design of the substation to accord with the principles of the Design and Access statement. Is the local planning authority content with the Design and Access Statement being sufficient to ensure that design, scale and layout of the substation and the access would minimise impact on the openness of the Green Belt, on its character and appearance as well as its purposes?
- 3.5 In the Rampion DCO the height of the sub-station building is restricted to 6m and other structures restricted to 10.5m. What is the justification for the 14m/11m (substation building and external equipment respectively) maximum height restrictions under DCO Requirements 10(3) and 10(4)?
- 3.6 Any tree or shrub or tree lost, damaged or diseased within 5 years of planting is to be replaced, under DCO Requirement 21(4). Would the period of 5 years allow sufficient time for the landscaping around the substation site to mature sufficiently and contribute to its intended purpose?

Wednesday, 26 November PM

4. Socio-economics, tourism and recreation

Invited attendees

- Applicant
- Borough of Poole
- Bournemouth Borough Council
- Bournemouth Tourism Management Board
- Bournemouth Town Centre Management Board
- Challenge Navitus
- Christchurch District Council
- Dorset County Council
- East Dorset District Council
- Isle of Wight Council
- Meyrick Estate
- New Forest District Council
- Poole and Christchurch Bays Association
- Purbeck District Council
- Swanage and Purbeck Hospitality Association
- Dr Phillip Bratby

4.1 Tourism

- The amount of tourism spending in the local area.
- The sensitivity of the local economy to changes in tourism spending.

- The strength / fragility of tourism businesses, including consideration of Written Representations from Bournemouth Tourism Management Board and others.
- Implications for the levels of sensitivity of tourism used in the Environmental Statement.
- The definition of local and regional levels for impact assessment, with reference to the concerns expressed by Dorset County Council in item 12.3 of their Written Representation.
- The need to consider “micro-level” effects and the progress in considering these.
- The impact of the length of the construction period exceeding the 3 to 4.5 year period considered in the assessment.
- The robustness of the use of perception surveys to assess impacts, including with reference to the Applicant’s Deadline II Appendix 68 document.
- The robustness of the use of case studies to assess impacts, including with reference to the Applicant’s response 12.30.3 to the first written questions.
- Suitable metrics for the quantification of effects on tourism.
- The use of recent research by Ipsos MORI mentioned in paragraph 9 of the Applicant’s Deadline II Appendix 68 document.
- Evidence available to support assertions made in Written Representations and Local Impact Reports about impacts on tourism.
- The need to provide evidence that adverse tourism impacts will not occur.
- Progress in discussions to provide additional support for tourism through a visitor centre and other actions.
- Progress with other mitigations, including compensations, enhancement measures or disruption agreements.
- The timing of finalisation of any mitigation measures and agreements and how these will be secured. Identification of any discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

4.2 Recreation

- Impacts on recreational fishing, diving, cycling, horse riding and mitigation.
- Progress with disruption agreements with recreational related fishing and diving businesses.
- Impacts on recreation in Hurn Forest and mitigation.
- Impacts on recreational sailing and motor boating and mitigation. Related economic impacts on businesses in or supporting this sector.

- Mitigation of reduced visitor numbers and reduced turnover in tourist and recreation related businesses reliant on the recreation draw of the area mentioned in the Applicant's response 12.18.1 to the first written questions.
- Update on further work being undertaken by the Applicant to identify specific impacts on operations of businesses.
- The timing of finalisations of any mitigation measures and agreements and how these will be secured. Identification of any discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

4.3 Other socio-economic

- Impacts at the national level mentioned by Dr Phillip Bratby in his Written Representation
- Inconsistencies in the Applicant's impact assessment mentioned by Challenge Navitus in their Written Representation 10.
- The need to consider "environmental amenity losses" and "economic analysis of gains and losses to consumer and producer groups" mentioned by Challenge Navitus in their Written Representation 11.
- Impacts on the "grey pound" mentioned by Poole and Christchurch Bays Association in their Written Representation.
- Impacts on commercial fishing, shipping, diving and aggregate extraction. Mitigation and progress in finalising mitigations, compensations, enhancement measures or disruption agreements.
- Multiplier effects of impacts on commercial businesses within the local economy.
- The extent to which local economic benefits from construction, operation and maintenance will mitigate adverse impacts on tourism, including reference to Bournemouth Borough Council's Written Representation and item 12.3 of Isle of Wight Council's Written Representation.
- The extent to which the location of the local operation and maintenance port will effect local socio-economic benefits and mitigate adverse impacts on tourism.
- The impact on the timing of the decision on the location of the local operation and maintenance port on the socio-economic benefits, with reference to the concerns expressed by Dorset County Council in item 12.3 of their Written Representation and Isle of Wight Council in item 1.10 of their Written Representation.
- The need to set requirements or targets for local economic benefits, with reference to the concerns expressed by Dorset County Council in item 12.3 of their Written Representation.
- The need for the socio-economic benefits to provide a legacy of skilled people, with reference to the concerns raised by the Borough of Poole and Bournemouth Borough Council in their Written Representations.

- Progress with steering groups considering supply chain and employment benefits and establishing a s106 Agreement.
- Progress in establishing a Skills Forum.
- Evidence of impacts on Language Schools.
- Impacts if the UNESCO World Heritage Site designation is lost. The value of the designation to SMEs as mentioned by Dorset County Council in item 12.15 of their Written Representation.
- Opportunities for community involvement, as mentioned by Meyrick Estates in their Written Representation.
- Progress with other mitigations, including compensations, enhancement measures or disruption agreements.
- The timing of finalisations of any mitigation measures and agreements and how these will be secured. Identification of any discharging, approving and consulted bodies.
- Relevant DCO / DML requirements.

Day 3 – Thursday 27 November AM

- 1. Welcome, introductions and explanation of procedure at the hearing.**
- 2. DCO – outstanding matters**

Day 4 – Friday 27 November (If Required)

- 1. Miscellaneous matters or rollover from previous sessions**