



## Meeting note

<b>File reference</b>	EN010080
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Lisa Spice
<b>Date</b>	20 March 2018
<b>Meeting with</b>	Ørsted
<b>Venue</b>	Teleconference
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>The Planning Inspectorate:</b> Chris White – Infrastructure Planning Lead Kay Sully – Case Manager Karl-Jonas Johansson – Case Officer Lisa Spice – Case Officer Helen Lancaster – Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor Stephanie Newman – EIA and Land Rights Advisor <b>Applicant:</b> Stuart Livesey Sophie Banham
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Hornsea Project Three project update meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

#### Welcome and Introductions

The Applicant and the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) team introduced themselves and their respective roles. The Inspectorate outlined its openness policy and ensured that those present understood that any issues discussed and advice given would be recorded and placed on the Inspectorate's website under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). Further to this, it was made clear that any advice given did not constitute legal advice upon which the Applicant (or others) can rely.

#### Project Update

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that the application will contain two options for how the electricity will be exported to the grid, High Voltage Alternating Current and High Voltage Direct Current, and that the difference between these and need to consider both options for the eventual development is explained on its project

website's FAQ section. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to be prepared to justify this approach during the examination.

### **Outcome from the further consultation**

The Applicant advised that the further round of s42 consultation is on-going, but is due to end on 30 March 2018. The Applicant is not expecting the consultation to lead to any significant changes to the application.

There have been some recent meetings with local parish councils to update them about the project.

### **Cable routing**

The Inspectorate informed the Applicant that it had become aware of newspaper articles questioning why the export cables couldn't share the same cable corridor as Vattenfall's Vanguard and Boreas projects. The Applicant clarified that it was aware that this question had come up in the past and had mentioned this to National Grid (NG). This is dictated by grid connection location which is different for the two projects and therefore it would not be possible to share the corridors between projects. The Applicant confirmed that this matter had also been raised on some of the s42 responses, and that a response has been noted in the consultation report. The Applicant confirmed it had received one grid connection offer from NG to Norwich Main.

The Applicant also advised that Norfolk County Council has sent a letter to the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) regarding the cable routing, and that whilst it had been copied into this correspondence, it had not been requested to respond to this directly, it was a series of questions/comments directed at BEIS. The Inspectorate informed the Applicant that the Examining Authority is likely to raise questions about the BEIS letter during the examination.

### **Environmental update**

The Applicant confirmed that the onshore ecology assessment was nearing completion. However, there were still unresolved issues in respect of benthic ecology, which are unlikely to be resolved before the start of the Examination. The Applicant has had regard to Natural England's concerns and will address these in the application where more information will be available to interested parties. It acknowledged that Natural England were concerned about the baseline data but the Applicant's project view is that the data available from other sources was sufficient to characterise the baseline.

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that Natural England were concerned that the offshore cable corridor might cross a cobble reef but added that in their view there was no evidence of this in the data that had been available to the project in carrying out their assessment.

The final Evidence Plan steering group meeting is due imminently. The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that it has had no confirmation from Natural England that it will attend the meeting and that the Marine Management Organisation's advisor is unable to attend the event.

## **Compulsory acquisition**

The Applicant explained that they are still in negotiations with one landowner in particular with regard to the proposed cable route traversing their property. The Inspectorate informed the Applicant that the Examination Authority will look at how it has justified the need for the compulsory acquisition of the land in the application. The Applicant was advised to evidence in the consultation report the negotiations carried out with all landowners.

## **Traffic**

The proposed main construction compound, situated on an airfield site in the vicinity of Oulton village, was discussed. Oulton Parish Council has expressed concerns regarding the volume and nature of traffic that this may create as the main access road is residential and narrow. The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that Vattenfall's Norfolk Vanguard project also intended to use the airfield. The Applicant confirmed that it would share its traffic data with Vattenfall when it has completed its own traffic studies, likely to be after submission. The Applicant confirmed that the existing traffic information contained in the assessment of cumulative effects will be updated, to take this new information into account.

The Inspectorate advised that Oulton Parish Council had contacted them directly and that it had been given information regarding how they could input into the pre-application consultation process, and had been directed to the s51 advice that had been published to date. Oulton Parish Council had been advised to discuss these matters directly with the Applicant.

## **Access to land**

The Applicant advised the Inspectorate that it was currently not intending to submit an application to enter land under s53 of PA2008 as it was of the opinion that it had collected all the necessary data. The Applicant was requested to notify the Inspectorate as soon as possible if it intended to submit an s53 application.

## **Draft documents review**

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that it would submit a diagram regarding s42 consultation to be included in the Consultation Report for review/comment.

## **Access to consultation material**

Issues regarding display copies of the consultation material were discussed. The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that only the main library in Norwich had currently agreed to store a hard copy of the application. The Inspectorate stated that it was of the opinion that as long as the documents were accessible online this should suffice, as feedback from previous examinations suggested that few people access the hard copies. Hard copies could instead be provided on request, the Applicant stated that this would need to be at a cost and the availability of these documents on USB sticks, on the PINS website and on the Applicant's website should be sufficient. The Applicant was also advised to bring hard copies of the application documents to the examination hearings for use by attendees if required.

## **Examination**

Possible meeting venues and accommodation options were discussed, there is little available locally in more rural areas. The Applicant would create an overview based on experience from hosting several rounds of community consultation events etc to assist The Planning Inspectorate.

With regard to security at examination events, the Applicant confirmed they can assist in providing the Planning Inspectorate with contact numbers for the local police, so the Inspectorate can make them aware of the hearing dates, times and locations when this information is finalised.

The hearing venue would ideally be somewhere on the proposed cable route, or in a central location. The Inspectorate advised that there would need to be access to WiFi if possible at the venues, and a projector screen available to display relevant documents. A dedicated person from the Applicant's team to manage the IT arrangements on the day would be helpful.

A plan of the site inspection route has yet to be drawn up, the Applicant could provide an overview of key areas of interest onshore for the Examining Authority, the Inspectorate requested access to this at the earliest opportunity, along with access details (eg, of any public rights of way), which might facilitate unaccompanied site inspections. The Applicant would seek to develop this after the submission.

The Applicant advised that the route is 55 miles long, and that some of the public footpaths are very overgrown. The Applicant will work with the Inspectorate to draw up a detailed itinerary for the accompanied site inspections.

## **Date of next meeting**

Proposed date of 17 April 2018.

## **Proposed date of submission**

May 2018, exact date to be confirmed

## **Specific decision/follow ups**

- **The Applicant to send the Inspectorate its local authorities contacts details**