

Application by Norfolk Boreas Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Windfarm Project

Issue Specific Hearing:	Onshore effects including the draft Development Consent Order
Date:	21 January 2020 at 10.00am
Location:	Blackfriars Hall, St Andrew's Plain, Norwich, NR3 1AU

Requested Attendees

- The Applicant
- Norfolk County Council (NCC)
- Breckland Council (Breckland C)
- Broadland District Council (Broadland DC)
- North Norfolk District Council (NNDC)

The Examining Authority (ExA) also notes that at the time of publication of this agenda, a number of Interested Parties had registered to attend, including Parish Councils had indicated their intention to be present at the Issue Specific Hearing, including: Cawston Parish Council (Cawston PC), Corpusty and Saxthorpe Parish Council (Corpusty and Saxthorpe PC), Happisburgh Parish Council (Happisburgh PC), Necton Parish Council (Necton PC), Oulton Parish Council (Oulton PC).

The ExA welcomes involvement from all Interested Parties at the Issue Specific Hearing.

Purpose of the Issue Specific Hearing into Onshore effects including the draft Development Consent Order.

The main purpose of the hearing is to:

- Seek clarity and resolution, if possible, of matters where differences exist between parties and to establish those matters where parties consider resolution is unlikely;
- Seek other clarifications from submissions at Deadline 2 and Deadline 3;
- Establish or confirm the views of other Interested Parties as to the appropriateness, proportionality or efficacy of proposals;
- Agree and/or request further work or refinement of existing documents which would form part of the dDCO or are secured through the dDCO.
- Consider the implications of the letter from the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy requesting updates or information in relation to the Norfolk Vanguard Off Shore Wind Farm Application 'the Norfolk Vanguard letter' [REP3-012].

Agenda

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE HEARING

2. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

a) Cawston (including noise and vibration and heritage matters)

- I. To understand the background to the matters raised in the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012];
- II. To examine concerns relating to Link 34 (B1145 from the B1149 Holt Road junction, through Cawston village to the eastern town extents of Reepham) including the implications of the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012];
- III. To consider proposals for alternative access arrangements to the cable corridor, including alternative haul route construction methods [REP2-067];
- IV. To examine in detail the Highway Intervention Scheme referred to by the Applicant [REP1-024, Appendix 6] in relation to mitigation of construction traffic impacts of Hornsea Three and cumulative impacts with Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas, including road safety issues and footpath widening;
- V. To consider further the in combination and cumulative traffic effects should Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Three receive development consent. This to include the relevance to the Norfolk Boreas application of the proposed amendment set out in paragraph 16 of the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012];
- VI. To consider the approach to assessment of noise and vibration including structural surveys; and
- VII. To gain clarity on the adverse heritage effects and their mitigation based on parties' (the Applicant and Broadland DC) seemingly different positions regarding the Heritage Statement in the Cawston Conservation Area Position Statement (for Norfolk Vanguard) [REP2-022, Appendices 1.1 and 1.2].

b) Oulton

- I. Link 68 – The Street. To understand in further detail the methodology used to determine baseline data for vehicle movement, including how events such as increased traffic over harvest periods from agricultural vehicles are taken into account;
- II. Link 68 – The Street. To understand the mitigation proposed for Link 68 including the effectiveness of the pilot vehicle mitigation method to alleviate the effect of HGV and Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movement in both directions on Link 68 when considered cumulatively with for Hornsea Project Three;
- III. To understand the purpose of the Cable Logistics Area in Oulton and what it would be used for;
- IV. To understand the traffic management proposals in relation to the Cable Logistics Area;

- V. To understand the reasons for the increase in cumulative daily HGV movements over a 3 year period on Link 68 (from 118 to 183) and whether these would be spread out evenly across the year or concentrated at certain times during harvest for example [REP2-027];
- VI. To understand whether the change in cumulative HGV movements at the CLA would influence the outcome of the ES cumulative assessment; and
- VII. To consider whether there are any other implications in relation to Oulton arising from the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012].

c) Link 69 – North Walsham, Little London Road from the B1145 Lyngate Road junction to an access point approximately 210m east

- I. To understand the effects of street closures 8a-8b, 8c-8d, 8e-8f and 8g-8h on residents and local traffic movements;
- II. To consider the proposals for a Communications Plan in greater detail [REP2-021, Table 14], including who will be consulted and when? How would the implementation of a Communications Plan reduce pedestrian severance and amenity in relation to Link 69?

d) Additions to Trenchless crossings

- I. Given paragraph 20 and 21 of the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012], to understand whether there are any unresolved matters in relation to the B1149 or other locations that should be added to the list of trenchless crossings set out in Requirement 16 (13) of the dDCO.

e) Timing of traffic management measures

- I. To consider the relevance to the Norfolk Boreas application of the proposed amendment set out in paragraph 24 of the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012].

f) Outline Traffic Management Plan

- I. To consider whether the Outline Traffic Management Plan should be further updated given discussions in relation to 2a) – e) above.

3. CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS

a) Construction Hours

- I. To understand the reasoning for the types of locations that are considered sensitive receptors when determining construction hours;
- II. To explain the provisions made for the mitigation for impacts arising from non-standard construction hours; and
- III. To consider the relevance to the Norfolk Boreas application of the proposed amendment set out in paragraph 26 of the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012].

b) Cable duct installation

- I. To understand the exclusions that might apply in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Scheme (OLEMS), which would only secure 150m workfronts "where possible" in the onshore cable duct installation. How could a stronger commitment to the duct installation strategy be secured, or an indicative alternative strategy, should the proposed strategy not be viable in certain locations.

c) Noise and Vibration

- I. To consider the relevance to the Norfolk Boreas application of the proposed amendment set out in paragraph 28 of the Norfolk Vanguard letter [REP3-012].

d) Landfall at Happisburgh

- I. To consider further the concerns that Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) is most high risk at Happisburgh, could lead to mud breakout at landfall, and requires 24hour working to maintain the tunnel. This to include consideration of the wider context of the benefits and disbenefits of long HDD as opposed to other methods such as Direct Pipe or Micro Tunnelling mentioned in the submission [REP1-045]; and
- II. To consider whether the HDD entry provides adequate protection for the drilled cable or transition pits from natural coastal erosion (predicted to be between 50m to 110m by 2065).

4. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS (INCLUDING HEDGEROWS)

a) Trees and hedgerows, Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)

- I. To clarify that Q9.3.1 does not refer only to the substations site. To establish the possible timescale for the Applicant to prepare the requested plan(s) for tree removal for Scenario 2; and
- II. To establish if local authorities and other parties are content with the Applicant's response to Q9.5.5 regarding the terminology in the current OLEMS lacking certainty, and that this certainty would be provided in the Landscape Management Scheme because another level of design at a more detailed scale is required to consolidate the design principles to deliver the mitigation [REP2-021].

b) Substations at Necton

- I. To understand from the Applicant the maximum extent height controls in Requirement 16 of the dDCO, together with heights mentioned in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and ES secured through the Outline Plans with reference to the Applicant's response to Necton PC's response to Q5.3.3 [REP3-003]. Is it that buildings housing "principal electrical equipment" differ from "other electrical equipment" in terms of the height limitations? Is any of the "other electrical equipment" contained in buildings, or is it all external? It may be helpful for the Applicant to use some of the visualisations/ photomontages to assist the explanation.

- II. If Mr King or Ms Lockwood is present, to have the differences of opinion regarding the landform in the visualisation for VP3 [APP-511] and/ or [APP-523] explained using the visualisations and an OS map (Applicant to make available on screen) firstly by Mr King/ Ms Lockwood and then by the Applicant [REP3-007].
- III. For the Applicant to provide clarity on Work 10A – would this external electrical equipment be housed in a building or would it all be of the type of external (fenced but not enclosed in a building) electrical equipment which can currently be seen on the Necton site?
- IV. To seek views on whether this Work should be controlled further, if so in what way, as referred to in the Norfolk Vanguard letter as set out in paragraph 18 [REP3-012]. Whether the design approach and Design Guide could be a suitable way.
- V. To understand further from the Applicant how the design approach and Design Guide (now described in the DAS [REP2-010, para 5.3.6]) which would be prepared post consent, and its approval process would take place. To understand what aspects "*could be influenced*" and who the key stakeholders would be as set out in the SoCG with Breckland C [REP2-039, Table 8]. To understand if the design approach and Design Guide would cover all substations' works.
- VI. To invite views from Interested Parties (including NPC and other IPs such as Necton Substation Action Group with an interest in the appearance and visibility of the substations) as to whether they are content with the proposed addition to the DAS, or whether they think that more detail is required.
- VII. To understand Breckland C's opinion and role in the proposed design approval process as mentioned in its Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-062].

5. OTHER MATTERS

- I. To explore concerns relating to the 1996 RDAF crash near the substation and potential Aquifer Contamination.
- II. To update discussions regarding the impact of the cable corridor construction on local tourism and businesses. NNDC to give an overview of what would be expected in a tourism and associated business impact mitigation strategy to address the likely adverse impacts on the tourism sector within North Norfolk. The Applicant to respond.
- III. To provide an update on any proposal for a compensation fund for residents and businesses affected by construction.

6. DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER AND DISCHARGE OF POST CONSENT APPROVALS

a) Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)

- I. To consider further the Applicant's response to Q5.1.3 regarding the need for definitions for 'stage' (geographical only) and 'phase' (temporal only). To explore with the Applicant examples of how the works would be constructed once a main contractor was in place in relation to stages. To

- relate this to the approvals processes required for pre-commencement and commencement.
- II. To clarify whether there is any site preparation work that could take place pre-commencement, that would not be secured by Requirement 20(4). If so, to consider how these works could be secured.
 - III. Following updates and responses regarding the dDCO and the OCoCP clarity is required regarding the relationships of the OCoCP with all the other Outline plans and how matters are secured. Other Outline plans are stated as secured as "*Separate requirements outwith the CoCP*". In places the OCoCP covers matters covered by other Outline plans. In places it appears that matters are split between the OCoCP and other Outline plans and therefore across different Requirements. Therefore, there is a power to install/ erect, but it is not compelled to consider in relation to the OCoCP. The Applicant will be requested to talk this through using the Relationship of Onshore Plans secured by the DCO diagram [APP-022, Annex 1]. Views will be sought from post consenting authorities.
 - IV. Following the response to ExA's Written Questions [REP2-021, Q5.3.12], the Applicant to explain why NSRs should not be defined in the 'Interpretation' section in Part 1 of the dDCO to provide a link with the ES.

b) Discharge of post consent approvals

- I. For the Applicant and NCC to clarify the statement from NCC's LIR regarding planning performance agreement(s) (PPA) "*It is understood through discussions on the Norfolk Vanguard project DCO that each local authority discharges those requirements within their respective area/ statutory remit, for consistency the Norfolk Boreas DCO should follow the same approach to the discharging of conditions. It is also understood that the applicant is prepared to fund the above "discharging" work given the significant resource implication. The discharge of requirements and their funding is expected to be covered through a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA).*" [REP2-085] and the Applicant's response "*The Applicant is also exploring the potential for a Planning Performance Agreement*" [REP3-008, Section 5].
- II. To understand from the local authorities how expertise of the kind necessary to assess post consent approval designs and details for discharging requirements would be accessed, secured and assured.

7. CLOSE OF ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING