



The Planning Inspectorate

Application by Ørsted Hornsea Project Four Limited for an Order granting Development Consent for Hornsea Project Four Offshore Wind Farm

Hearing Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 11 (ISH11) dealing with matters relating to marine ornithology held virtually on Thursday 21 July 2022

Action	Description	Action by	When
1	When the Applicant is considering marine and coastal ornithology and responding to Natural England's (NE) additional submission [AS-048], to copy the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) directly (unless first submitted at D6 when they will be shared with everyone).	Applicant	Any time
2	Provide a succinct summary and commentary on the comparison between outputs from MRSea_v1 versus MRSea_v2.	Applicant	Deadline (D) 6
3	NE to clarify its comment in the Additional Submission [AS-048] that, " <i>As v2 of the baseline has been agreed and demonstrated to be a significant improvement against v1, we do not consider it appropriate and/or necessary to compare the outputs of the two.</i> "	NE	D6
4	Consider providing a succinct summary of the differences in significance of effect deriving from the outputs of MRSea_v1 and _v2, whether there is any need to revise mitigation requirements or the conclusions on residual effect. Give an explanation of why the Applicant believes that the Environmental Statement (ES) does not need to be updated as a result.	Applicant	D6
5	Review position, and if necessary, add the final versions of the <i>Revised Ornithology Baseline</i> and the <i>Ornithology EIA and HRA Annex</i> to Schedule 15 of the draft	Applicant	D7

Action	Description	Action by	When
	Development Consent Order to be secured as part of the final ES.		
6	Submit revised modelling/ analysis for kittiwake following NE's advice [REP5a-029] in relation to a flaw that had been identified in the recommended Population Viability Analysis (PVA) tool.	Applicant	D6
7	NE and RSPB to update their positions on the suitability of the revised ornithological baseline for use in the assessment.	NE and RSPB	D6
8	Review the <i>Ornithological Assessment Sensitivity Report</i> [REP5-065] to provide further clarification about which data set has been used.	Applicant	D6
9	Clarify in post-Hearing note that section 3.3.5.1 of the <i>Ornithological Assessment Sensitivity Report</i> [REP5-065] should refer to '-42%' and provide the correct title for Figure 25.	Applicant	D6
10	In relation to the disagreement over the use of the core breeding season, and your comment in [AS-048] that "... ultimately, the difference is only likely to affect gannet displacement numbers and is unlikely to make a material difference to our conclusions relating to significance of impact/ impact to site integrity", please clarify if this is intended to mean that there is no longer a perceived problem in relation to gannets, or if your position in the most up-to-date risk and issues log [REP5-112] remains.	NE	D6
11	NE to update on its position on the assessment of guillemot and razorbill displacement impacts, including whether this changes in the light of the Applicant's <i>Ornithological Assessment Sensitivity Report</i> [REP5-065], and its opinion on the degree to which outputs from the assessment vary between its preferred approach and that used by the Applicant.	NE	D6

Action	Description	Action by	When
	Provide specific comment on the outputs of the Applicant's <i>Ornithological Assessment Sensitivity Report</i> [REP5-065] in relation to NE's advocated upper limit for displacement of auks.		
12	NE and RSPB to confirm whether they accept the Applicant's analysis that a kittiwake productivity rate of 0.800 should be used instead of 0.580?	NE and RSPB	D6
13	NE and RSPB to confirm whether they accept the Applicant's suggestion that guillemot survival data should be used as a proxy for razorbill data in the additional razorbill PVA modelling?	NE and RSPB	D6
14	RSPB to provide an updated position on the need to use both counterfactuals (Counterfactual of Population Growth Rate and Counterfactual of Final Population Size) having seen the further revisions.	RSPB	D6
15	NE to provide a similar update to action point 14 for the RSPB but noting that in [AS-048], NE maintains both counterfactuals should be provided as has been done in " <i>all recent OWF assessments</i> ".	NE	D6
16	Review and provide a summary of the reference made to, and the use made of, both counterfactuals in the last six relevant offshore wind farm Development Consent Order decisions. (Post-Hearing suggestion: this could include any recommendation or position taken by the Examining Authority (ExA) and Secretary of State in each case.)	Applicant	D6
17	NE to comment on or signpost its up-to-date position on the use of the migration-free breeding season rather than the full breeding season, given the outputs from the Applicant's Sensitivity Report [REP5-065], and noting its advice in its D5a letter [REP5a-029].	NE	D6
18	NE and RSPB to comment on the use of a 70% macro avoidance factor in	NE and RSPB	D6

Action	Description	Action by	When
	the combined displacement and collision mortality assessment for gannet, noting that the Applicant does also provide a range around this central figure.		
19	Do NE and RSPB believe that the ExA and Secretary of State can now have full confidence in the marine ornithology environmental impact assessment, or is further work and commentary still needed before that stage is reached?	NE and RSPB	D6
20	NE and RSPB to comment on the Applicant's report into <i>Indirect Effects of Forage Fish and Ornithology</i> [REP5-085] and the extent to which they believe that the findings affect the overall ornithological assessment.	NE and RSPB	D6
21	Update Statements of Common Ground with NE and RSPB so that the ExA can clearly identify any outstanding points of difference that may remain at the close of the Examination.	Applicant, NE and RSPB	D7