



Meeting note

Project name	Hornsea Project Four Offshore Windfarm
File reference	EN010098
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate)
Date	28 January 2020
Meeting with	Ørsted (the Applicant)
Venue	Temple Quay House
Meeting objectives	Project update
Circulation	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.

Project update

The Applicant explained that it had graded all documents based on risk and would have use the additional time before the submission in Quarter 3 2020 to work on those areas deemed higher risk.

The Applicant noted the overlap of its offshore area of lease with that of the White Rose Carbon Capture and Storage Project. The Inspectorate advised that the Applicant should prepare for questions on this matter in the Examination should the Application be submitted and accepted.

The Applicant provided a summary of continued negotiations, which included:

- DFDS, the British Chamber of Shipping and Danish Shipping on navigation routes
- Spirit Energy, Perenco and Premier on distance from helipad platforms

Negotiations with Holderness Fishing Industry Group and specific local fishermen had resulted in a coexistence agreement. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to think about how commercial agreements are tracked through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.

The Applicant said it had presented all the material changes that would be made post section 47 consultation. It had agreed three different options for substation designs and presented options for different Public Rights of Way. It mentioned how the local community had been involved in the substation design from the beginning and that it had committed to plant screening so that it would mature by the time construction started. The Inspectorate noted that this seemed positive.

The Applicant talked through a number of changes including 34 amendments to the export cable corridor, access road, logistics compound and temporary access roads.

Examples of these changes were cable corridor movements of between two metres and 30 metres and realignment of logistics compounds.

The Applicant said it would take two options for the cable route into examination due to continued disagreement between an owner and a lessee. The Inspectorate suggested that the Applicant should be able to clearly present the differences between the two options as the Examining Authority may question them on this should the Application proceed to Examination.

The Applicant spoke about how it would undertake further targeted consultation. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to make clear in the consultation report where it had carried out full consultation and where it had carried out targeted consultation and to provide justification for this approach.

Proportionality in EIA:

The Inspectorate and the Applicant discussed the development of the Environmental Statement (ES). The Applicant asked whether it could provide an updated Impacts Register to the Inspectorate so advice could be provided on whether the scope of the EIA at the point of Application was correct and aligned with The Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion on matters that were agreed to be "Scoped out". The Inspectorate said that the scope could be refined from the scoping opinion given by the Inspectorate if evidence and justification is provided. The Applicant said where it had now scoped out aspects that previously required detailed assessment it had provided new base line data and additional information. The Inspectorate said it agreed with this approach.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Inspectorate to provide further advice on how the scope of an ES can be refined post-scoping opinion