



National Infrastructure
Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer 0303 444 5000
Services: HornseaProjectThree@pins.gsi.gov.uk
e-mail:

To Maritime and Coastguard Agency
For information to all Interested Parties

Your Ref:

Our Ref: EN010080

Date: 26 February 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

Planning Act 2008 and the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 17

Application by Orsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Ltd for an Order granting Development Consent for the Proposed Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm

Examining Authority's request for further information

The questions set out below are directed to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA). However, this does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Please respond by **Deadline 7 – Thursday 14 March 2019**.

Ref	Question/request for further information from the Maritime and Coastguard Agency
<i>Helicopter Refuge Areas (Principle 5)</i>	
F1.1	The Applicant has commented in response to Q2.5.5 [REP4-012] that fitting automatic identification transmitters on selected turbines would aid orientation for search and rescue (SAR) pilots. The Applicant suggests that that, in poor visibility (less than 1000m), a refuge area would not assist with orientation because the spacing of turbines would be such that the refuge area would not be visible in any event. How do you respond?
<i>Width of development lanes (Principle 8)</i>	
F1.2	The Applicant has suggested that your Deadline 3 comments on the Applicant's response to Q1.5.4 [REP3-084] imply that, in SAR operations, only a visual search is effective. How do you respond?

Lines of orientation (Principle 3)	
F1.3	<p>You have acknowledged in response to Q2.5.1 [REP4-129] that previous offshore wind farms have been approved with a single line of orientation but you consider that those examples were undesirable. We understand that Hornsea Project 1 and Hornsea Project 2 were approved with a single line of orientation.</p> <p>Are there any site-specific considerations that might lead to a different conclusion for Hornsea Project 3?</p>
F1.4	<p>In relation to any comparison with Hornsea Project 1 and Hornsea Project 2, the Applicant states that the location of Hornsea Project 3 would be further offshore (thus likely to have fewer small craft), would have a lower traffic density and the spacing of the turbines would be greater – factors the Applicant considers make it more suitable for a single line of orientation [REP6-009].</p> <p>How do you respond?</p>
F1.5	<p>The Applicant has set out a safety case for a single line of orientation in answer to our WQ2.5.1 [REP4-012]. The points made include low numbers of vessels, consultation feedback, the minimum spacing of turbines being greater than other Round 3 offshore wind farms and the advice of its SAR specialist.</p> <p>What is your response to the Applicant's safety case?</p>
F1.6	<p>Is it your view that a safety case for single line of orientation can only be persuasive where (amongst other factors) there is a proposed array layout for you to consider rather than a set of proposed layout principles?</p>
What if the Layout Development Principles are not agreed by the end of the examination?	
F1.7	<p>In the event that the Layout Development Principles have not been agreed by the end of the examination would it be appropriate to refer to them in the conditions of the Deemed Marine Licences?</p>
F1.8	<p>If the Deemed Marine Licences did not refer to the Layout Development Principles would the requirement for the array layout to be approved by the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in consultation with MCA and Trinity House provide the Secretary of State with sufficient assurance in relation to effects on navigation safety and SAR operations?</p>

Yours faithfully

David Prentis

Lead Member of the Panel of Examining Inspectors

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.