



## Meeting note

<b>Project name</b>	Hornsea Project Four Offshore Windfarm
<b>File reference</b>	EN010098
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Date</b>	28 November 2019
<b>Meeting with</b>	Ørsted
<b>Venue</b>	Teleconference
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project update meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

### ***Programme update***

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that it had decided to delay its submission until Quarter 3 2020. It explained that this was due to: uncertainties within the current Development Consent Order (DCO) consenting landscape driven by delays at different points in the consenting process for a number of other DCO applications, in Examination and Determination; and feedback from key statutory stakeholders in relation to the Hornsea Project 4 Preliminary Environmental Information (PEIR) and Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA).

The Inspectorate asked whether this would introduce any risk in regards to the lease agreement from the Crown Estate. The Applicant replied that it had agreed the revised consenting programme following discussions with the Crown Estate.

The Applicant said it felt this delay would provide an opportunity to reduce the consent risk associated with the application and to improve the quality of the technical information available to parties, and also an opportunity for the Inspectorate to review draft documents.

### ***Statutory consultation***

The Applicant talked through some of the changes it had made since section(s)42 consultation. These included:

- To only assess the Maximum Design Scenario, previously a number of assessments had made reference to the Worst-Case Scenario and Realistic Worst-Case Scenario, resulting in some confusion to statutory stakeholders.
- To only use the term 'scoped out' in relation to the Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion and adopting "not considered further in the ES".



## The Planning Inspectorate

- Adding two new columns to the Proportionality in EIA table, which will show the position at PEIR, and subsequent position in the Environmental Statement (ES).

The Inspectorate advised that the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations require assessment of significant effects and therefore the methodology for establishing what is a significant effect must be included in the ES.

The Applicant continued to talk through changes made following consultation, these included:

- 30, mostly, minor changes to the export cable route;
- alterations to the configuration of the onshore substation site without changing the size of the footprint;
- the routing of construction traffic away from Cottingham and Dunswell;
- a reduction in the size of the offshore developable area;
- installation of the offshore export cable route through Horizontal Directional Drilling trenchless methods; and
- the choice to proceed with the southern cable landfall option.

The Applicant explained that one of the changes to the export cable would mean it might bring forward two cable options into the examination. However, it hoped this would be resolved prior to the DCO application being submitted.

The Applicant also mentioned that it may do further targeted consultation or another round of statutory consultation depending on the number of changes made to the project. The Inspectorate suggested that the Applicant should consider the DCLG guidance on the pre-application process with regard to the need for further re-consultation.

### ***DCO drafting***

The Applicant provided a progress update on the drafting of the DCO and noted discussions had taken place with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) concerning arbitration issues. The Applicant said it would wait on the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy's decision in relation to Norfolk Vanguard and draft the DCO for Hornsea Project Four based on this.

The Applicant mentioned it had been in discussion with the Ministry of Defence (MoD) in relation to assessing the impact of an air defence radar at Staxton Wold. It was the Applicant's understanding that no such radar existed and therefore it did not consider it necessary to assess the impact of it. The Inspectorate suggested the Applicant should allow for potential future mitigation in the DCO. The Applicant replied that it was seeking a commercial agreement with the MoD outside the DCO process as it didn't want to set a precedent of including that which didn't currently exist within the DCO.

The Inspectorate noted that reviewing the form of the DCOs, if granted, of Hornsea Project Three and Norfolk Vanguard will be useful in drafting the Hornsea Project Four DCO.

### ***Specific decisions/ follow-up required?***

The following actions were agreed:



## The Planning Inspectorate

- The Inspectorate to arrange a subsequent meeting in January
- Further dialogue between the Inspectorate and the Applicant in relation to the Habitats Regulations and IROPI