

Hornsea Project Three
Offshore Wind Farm



Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm

Written summary of Applicant's oral case put at Issue Specific
Hearing 10 (26th March 2019)

Date: 1st April 2019

Hornsea 3
Offshore Wind Farm

Orsted

Document Control			
Document Properties			
Organisation	Ørsted Hornsea Project Three		
Author	Pinsent Masons		
Checked by	Ørsted		
Approved by	Andrew Guyton		
Title	Written summary of Applicant's oral case put at Issue Specific Hearing 10 (26th March 2019)		
PINS Document Number	n/a		
Version History			
Date	Version	Status	Description / Changes
01/04/2019	A	Final	Submitted at Deadline 10 (1 st April 2019)

Ørsted

5 Howick Place,

London, SW1P 1WG

© Orsted Power (UK) Ltd, 2019. All rights reserved

Front cover picture: Kite surfer near a UK offshore wind farm © Ørsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Ltd., 2019.

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	1
2.	AGENDA ITEM 1 – INTRODUCTION OF THE PARTICIPATING PARTIES	1
3.	AGENDA ITEM 3 – ORAL REPRESENTATIONS	1

1. **INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

1.1 Issue Specific Hearing 10 ("ISH") was held at 09:30am on 26 March 2019 at the Mercure Norwich Hotel, 121-131 Boundary Road, Norwich, NR3 2BA.

1.2 The ISH took the form of running through items listed in the agenda published by the Examining Authority (ExA) on 15 March 2019 (the "Agenda"). The format of this note follows that of the Agenda. The Applicant's substantive oral submissions commenced at item 3 of the Agenda, therefore this note does not cover items 1 and 2 which were procedural and administrative in nature.

2. **AGENDA ITEM 1 – INTRODUCTION OF THE PARTICIPATING PARTIES**

2.1 The ExA: - David Prentis (Lead Panel Member), Guy Rigby, David Cliff and Dr Roger Catchpole.

2.2 The Applicant:

2.2.1 Speaking on behalf of the Applicant: - Claire Brodrick (Pinsent Masons LLP) and

2.2.2 Present from the Applicant: - Andrew Guyton (Project Manager), Sarah Drijaca (Environment and Consents Senior Project Lead) and Richard Grist (Senior Land and Property Manager).

2.2.3 The Applicant's legal advisor:- Peter Cole (Pinsent Masons LLP)

2.2.4 The Applicant's transport and highway safety consultant:- Paul Zanna (Technical Director at Create Consulting Engineers Ltd)

2.3 The following party participated in the ISH:

2.3.1 Cawston Parish Council (**CPC**)

3. **AGENDA ITEM 3 – ORAL REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Claire Brodrick confirmed that there were no additional affected persons as a result of the additional land included in the non-material amendment application, as all those affected were already affected by the original application. Ms Brodrick confirmed that the Applicant has received consent to the additional land application from all affected landowners and occupiers.

3.2 Addressing a question from CPC relating to the resurfacing of the road, Paul Zanna explained that Norfolk County Council (**NCC**) have a capital plan for the year 2019 to 2020, which makes provision for resurfacing in Cawston village, but that the Applicant has committed to undertaking this work if NCC did not first.

3.3 Mr Zanna stated that in meetings with NCC, the highway officers stated that the proposed buff textured surface would not be approved by NCC, as this would be different to other surfaces in the area and create additional maintenance obligations. Therefore, the Applicant had changed the road surface to grey in version 5 of the Cawston Traffic Intervention Scheme [REP9-049]. Mr Zanna confirmed that this was the only change between version 4 [REP7-047] and version 5 of the Cawston Traffic Intervention Scheme.

3.4 Regarding questions over disruption to Cawston during the undertaking of these resurfacing works, Mr Zanna advised that there would be an element of disruption, but that traffic management schemes would be introduced such as the use of temporary traffic lights, and these measures were standard and would be used whether the Applicant or NCC undertook the resurfacing works.

3.5 Regarding safety concerns, Mr Zanna advised that where roads are narrow, it was likely that the contractor employed by the Applicant or NCC would introduce an escort service to introduce an element

of control for speed. He clarified that if temporary traffic lights were used, a shuttle service could be implemented, with a vehicle placed in front of traffic to maintain a lower speed.

- 3.6 Responding to ExA comments on the potential need for a requirement to deal with further consultation and approval of the Cawston traffic intervention scheme, Andrew Guyton highlighted that the outline construction traffic management plan (CTMP) contains details relating to traffic management that must be approved by NCC in the final CTMP.
- 3.7 Ms Brodrick highlighted that the Cawston Traffic Intervention Scheme is iterative, as set out in the Applicant's deadline 7 submission [REP7-047]. She stated that the Applicant had sought to take into account the specific comments of CPC and residents, many of which had come forward during the later stages of the Examination. However, the Applicant had engaged with NCC, Broadland District Council and CPC throughout and had sought to agree the intervention scheme with NCC, including discussions around noise, vibration, heritage, and other considerations.
- 3.8 In response to an ExA question on how the Secretary of State would ensure the final scheme is appropriate, Ms Brodrick advised that the final CTMP would have to be in accordance with the outline CTMP. However, requirement 26 enables the CTMP to be varied provided that any variations must be in accordance with the environmental statement. It was therefore possible for a different traffic intervention scheme to be approved in the final CTMP but NCC would not be able to approve any scheme with impacts that had not been assessed. If a traffic intervention scheme was proposed that was beyond the scope of the environmental statement, a non-material amendment application may need to be made.
- 3.9 Mr Guyton stated that the Applicant would prepare a signposting document on traffic for use by Cawston residents as soon as possible, clarifying the location of information previously submitted into the Examination that addresses the comments made by local residents at open floor hearing 3.