



Meeting note

File reference	N/A
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	12 April 2018
Meeting with	Ørsted
Venue	Temple Quay House
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Hefin Jones (Case Manager) Siân Evans (Case Officer) David Price (EIA and Land Rights Manager) Ørsted Dr Julian Carolan (Consent Manager) Rita Stender Sapru (Project Development Manager)
Meeting objectives	Inception meeting for the Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm project
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

Introduction

Ørsted (the Applicant) and the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) case team introduced themselves and their respective roles. The Inspectorate outlined its openness policy and ensured those present understood that any issues discussed and advice given would be recorded and placed on the Inspectorate's website under s51 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.

Proposed development

The Applicant explained that when they acquired the Hornsea Zone from SMart Wind, Hornsea Project Four came with an Agreement for Lease from the Crown Estate and a 1.2GW grid connection offer at Creyke Beck from National Grid. This offer has not yet been signed.

The Hornsea Four offshore area is 860km², which has the capacity for 3.6GW if the site is developed to its full potential. The Applicant is currently considering the number and size of turbines and their locations so that it can develop its consenting strategy.

The Applicant advised that the offshore cable route will be approximately 100-120 km. The Applicant is currently looking at landfall selection and there will be approximately 20-30 km onshore cable route to a substation at Cottingham. The Applicant has not as yet decided whether the project will use Alternating Current or Direct Current technology.

The Applicant advised that they will be seeking compulsory acquisition powers within the Development Consent Order (DCO). Early engagement is proposed with stakeholders. At present, the Applicant is uncertain of the extent of Crown land that will be required at the landfall site but does not anticipate any problems in negotiations with The Crown Estate. The Applicant advised that there is National Trust land and common land within their onshore search areas and they will seek to avoid these.

The Applicant commented that there are many holiday homes in the onshore search area and the Inspectorate advised that this should be taken into consideration when the Applicant is undertaking its consultation to ensure the comments of visitors to the area are also captured.

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that it has appointed EIA consultants with good local knowledge and previous DCO experience. A legal team with previous DCO experience has also been appointed.

The Applicant explained its intent to use an Evidence Plan process for the Environmental Statement (ES) which will include setting up working groups with statutory bodies for all aspects to the ES. The Applicant is proposing to submit a proportionate ES which focusses on levels of detail in the various aspect assessments rather than the aspects themselves. Consequently they are not intending to scope out many aspects as they consider it is more pragmatic and cost effective to address detail. A tabulated approach is being considered. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to look at [Advice Note Seven: Environmental Impact Assessment: Preliminary Environmental Information, Screening and Scoping](#). This lists a number of questions which, if answered by an applicant, help provide sufficient information and confidence for the Inspectorate to agree on topics that can be scoped out of the ES. The Inspectorate confirmed that it welcomes the approach of more proportionate application documents as long as all the requirements in the relevant regulations are met.

The Applicant enquired whether an ES could be submitted in a digital format. The Inspectorate advised that they had recently given [s51 advice](#) on this.

The Applicant advised that they intend to start geophysical survey work in August 2018. The Applicant does not propose 100% data coverage for the whole Hornsea Four zone and advised that some stakeholders may consider the approach to data coverage as insufficient. The Applicant proposes to increase data coverage as the development area becomes more defined and advised that there will be 100% data coverage of the area that is built out.

The Applicant advised that they have two years of bird data which indicates a potential high impact on three species. Based on the current understanding of likely in-combination effects on the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area the

Applicant advised that they may need to progress an application for Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest for the purposes of HRA.

The Applicant explained that Hornsea projects One and Two were not fully built out and were considering how to release the available capacity from these projects to enable a more accurate assessment of in-combination effects for all four Hornsea projects.

The Inspectorate asked if the Applicant had considered whether the submission of Hornsea Project Three and its possible subsequent acceptance for Examination would affect the ability of statutory consultees to engage on Hornsea Project Four. The Applicant confirmed that they were aware of the stretched resources of statutory consultees.

The Applicant advised that they will be engaging with stakeholders in May and June 2018. The Applicant's current draft programme proposes to submit their scoping report to the Inspectorate in October 2018, statutory consultation in May 2019 and submission of their application in Q1-Q2 2020.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

The Inspectorate to send the project information template to the Applicant to set the project up on the Inspectorate's website.