

Meeting Note

File reference	EN010033 Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm
Status	Final
Author	Mike Harris

Meeting with	SMart Wind Ltd
Meeting date	16 th August 2011
Attendees (IPC)	Owain George (Case Lead) Mike Harris (Case Officer) Simon Butler (EIA and Land Rights Manager) Rebecca Pong (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor) Nicola Mathiason (Lawyer) Jan Bessell (Pre-application Commissioner)
Attendees (non IPC)	Chris Jenner (SMart Wind) Penny Pickett (SMart Wind) Andrew Prior (SMart Wind) Pat Hawthorn (Shepherd & Wedderburn)
Location	IPC Offices

Meeting Purpose	Project update meeting
------------------------	------------------------

Summary of key points discussed and advice given	<p>The IPC advised that any advice given would be recorded and published in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). Jan Bessell outlined her role as pre-application Commissioner which involves providing advice to the applicant, and others, about applying for an order granting development consent and making representations about an application. She set out that she would not be appointed to undertake the acceptance or examination of any future application.</p> <p>SMart Wind delivered a project update presentation which gave progress with consultation, the availability of project information (including access to metocean data via the applicants website) and various aspects of environmental survey/scoping work – link to slides</p> <p>With reference to the identified project timetable, specifically for the examination stage, the IPC clarified that the Examining Authority must complete the examination of the application by the end of a six month period, beginning the day after the preliminary meeting. As such, the length of the period between acceptance and the preliminary meeting is in part controlled by the applicant. This is dependent on when the applicant chooses to publicise the accepted application and advertise the period for registration and how long they provide for this,</p>
---	---

taking account of local circumstances and the time of year.

SMart Wind confirmed that they are replying directly to those consultation bodies which raised specific points to the IPC scoping opinion consultation. The IPC advised that it would assist the acceptance process if a table could be provided (at submission of an application) identifying how the Environmental Statement (ES) has addressed those comments, including where relevant mitigation measures are reflected in the Development Consent Order (DCO) requirements.

A discussion was held in relation to a proposed increase in the maximum rotor diameter from 150m to 178m. The IPC reiterated the advice given ([link](#)), specifically the importance of seeking the views of consultees and ensuring that they understand the potential changes proposed along with the possible resultant impacts. The IPC advised of the need to consider the impact on the s42 list of consultees of changes to the development boundary, should any changes be required.

Whilst discussing the intended approach to Habitat Regulation Assessment/Appropriate Assessment (HRA/AA) the IPC advised on the importance of ensuring that any reliance within the HRA Report on information in other documents, including the ES, is clearly referenced.

SMart Wind sought to understand how the practicalities of consulting on any potential transboundary impacts would operate. The IPC advised that it would be beneficial to think about this as early in the pre-application process as possible in order to:

- allow the IPC to undertake its initial consultation with the relevant EEA States prior to acceptance, and
- to avoid any possible delay during the acceptance/examination stages where, if required, further consultation with the affected EEA States on potential significant transboundary effects takes place.

It was confirmed that any information relating to the transboundary impacts of the project provided by the IPC to other EEA States would reflect that produced by SMart Wind. The IPC directed SMart Wind to Advice Note 12 on Transboundary Impacts - [link](#).

SMart Wind outlined the proposed approach to the provision/use of decommissioning bonds. The IPC advised that it would be for SMart Wind to determine whether to include provision for these within the DCO but that, in principle, one approach may be to incorporate such a provision within a section 106 agreement.

	<p>SMart Wind advised that they are seeking to have agreement in principle for the necessary pipeline crossings at the point of an application being submitted. The IPC advised that drafting of the DCO would need to be considered carefully in order to avoid provisions having the appearance of compulsory acquisition and importing powers into the DCO which are not actually being sought.</p> <p>SMart Wind outlined their approach to the Zone Appraisal and Planning (ZAP) process and its relationship to the assessment of cumulative impacts, alternatives and the process of design evolution. SMart Wind queried how to approach the consideration of the impacts of other projects, making particular reference to the ‘building blocks’ approach used when developing Round 2 wind farms. The IPC advised that when considering cumulative impacts of development it will be important to consider what is already known about existing and proposed projects, particularly in terms of the capacity of other offshore wind farm zones. The IPC referred to advice contained within the Scoping Opinion on this matter.</p>
<p>Specific decisions/ follow up required?</p>	<p>SMart Wind to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority contact details; • Confirmation of cable route preferred option when available; • Keep the IPC informed of any consultation activities.
<p>Circulation List</p>	<p>As per attendee list</p>