



SHEPHERD+ WEDDERBURN

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF

MORECAMBE WIND LIMITED (REF: 20049596)

IN CONNECTION WITH THE Application by Morgan Offshore Wind Limited
for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Morgan Offshore Wind
Farm

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This written representation is provided in accordance with Deadline 1 of the examination timetable for the application by Morgan Offshore Wind Farm Limited (the “**Applicant**”) for an Order under the Planning Act 2008 (the “**Act**”) granting Development Consent for the Morgan Offshore Wind Farm (the “**Project**”).
- 1.2 We represent six owners of operational offshore windfarms in the East Irish Sea (as set out relevant representations RR-005, RR-007, RR-023, RR-032, RR-043, RR-044), who we refer to together as the “**Ørsted IPs**”. This written representation is made on behalf of Morecambe Wind Limited (“**MWL**”) (RR-023), one of the Ørsted IPs.
- 1.3 The Ørsted IPs’ developments can be seen on Figure 9.4, in Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Other sea users) of the Environmental Statement (APP-027).
- 1.4 The Ørsted IPs, including MWL, have been engaged in a consultation process with the Applicant in respect of the potential impacts of the Project on the Ørsted IPs’ developments. The Ørsted IPs, including MWL, filed relevant representations in respect of the Project and were represented at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (“**ISH1**”) on 10 September.
- 1.5 As outlined in the relevant representations and at ISH1, the Ørsted IPs, including MWL, do not oppose the Project in principle. However, they have concerns regarding the interactions between the Project and their developments which are yet to be resolved. Primarily, MWL’s concerns relate to the effects of the Project on shipping and navigation, wake loss, and wildlife. These are addressed in turn below. The Ørsted IPs’ (including MWL’s) concerns regarding these matters were briefly presented during ISH1.

2. Wildlife Impacts/Environmental assessment

- 2.1 Given the increasingly complex nature of the existing and proposed development environment in the East Irish Sea, MWL has an interest in ensuring the EIA for the Project accurately assesses the potential effects of the Project on wildlife and identifies appropriate mitigation.
- 2.2 As discussed during ISH1, the Ørsted IPs, including MWL, consider the Applicant’s proposed approach to assessing the in-combination/cumulative effects of the Project (a ‘sensitivity’ analysis), is flawed. The information contained in EIA and Habitats Regulations Assessment must be complete and current in order for the examining authority and Secretary of State to properly undertake their assessments. If additional information is identified which is relevant to these assessments, it must be properly considered and the assessments must be updated by the Applicant.
- 2.3 The Ørsted IPs, including MWL, have raised concerns regarding the robustness of the Applicant’s ornithology and cumulative impact assessment. We understand that Natural England has raised similar concerns regarding the Applicant’s approach to these assessments and, in an effort to avoid duplication, we acknowledge that Natural England will be best placed to further address these concerns in the examination process. Issues identified in the Applicant’s assessment include, for example, that limited information on how collision risk modelling estimates for other projects have been adjusted for avoidance rate. Additionally, the Applicant’s ornithology assessment does not contain annual displacement totals for the project-alone.

3. Shipping and navigation

- 3.1 MWL (along with another Ørsted IP, Walney Extension Limited) has concerns regarding the impact of the Project on shipping and navigation.
- 3.2 MWL understands, based on the Applicant’s assessment and external advice, that the Project will result in a change in the level of risk at its development due to changes in the shipping and navigation environment.
- 3.3 The Applicant has committed in the ES, and recorded in its responses to the relevant representations, to continue engagement with stakeholders on this issue and to implement certain measures to manage increased risks associated with increased project vessel movements, search and rescue incidents and the risk of a marine pollution event, for example.

- 3.4 However, MWL consider it must be directly engaged with in respect of the management of risks which impact its development, to ensure that such risks are appropriately mitigated and its consents, agreements, and operations are not adversely affected. MWL considers it should be consulted in respect of and provided with copies of the Marine Pollution Contingency Plan, ERCoP and any Navigational Safety Plan.
- 3.5 MWL notes that it is likely a range of agreements will be reached between the Applicant and other sea users, such as vessel operators. Such agreements have the potential to impact the risks arising from shipping and navigation at MWL's development and how those risks should be assessed. Therefore, it is important that the outcome of discussions regarding any such agreements are transparent, to ensure that the wider implications are understood.
- 3.6 MWL notes the discussions during ISH1 regarding the possibility of a DCO requirement providing for a process for engagement with stakeholders on shipping and navigation. MWL will be interested to provide its views on such a requirement, if one is developed.

4. Energy Yield

- 4.1 Due to the proximity of the Project to the Ørsted IPs' developments (including MWL's), the Ørsted IPs are concerned the Project will interfere with the wind speed and/or direction at their developments and therefore adversely affect energy yields.
- 4.2 As canvassed during ISH1, the Ørsted IPs, including MWL, consider this effect must be properly assessed and addressed by the Applicant.
- 4.3 The NPS EN-3 requires that, where a potential offshore wind farm is proposed close to existing operational offshore infrastructure, or has the potential to affect activities for which a licence has been issued by government, the applicant should undertake an assessment of the potential effects of the proposed development on such existing or permitted infrastructure or activities. The Ørsted IPs are not satisfied that such assessment has been properly undertaken here.
- 4.4 As recorded in its response to MWL's relevant representation on this issue (PD1-017), the Applicant relies on compliance with the boundary requirements in TCE's Round 4 Leasing Information Memorandum to justify not carrying out this detailed assessment. The Ørsted IPs, including MWL, do not consider this approach is sufficient – the TCE memorandum relied on was not prepared for the purposes of providing guidance on this matter, or for generally regulating effects between sea users in the consenting process.
- 4.5 Additionally, the impacts of the Project on loss of energy generation at the Ørsted IPs' developments is relevant to evaluating the benefits of the Project in terms of emissions reductions and climate change benefits. We consider this assessment must calculate the 'net' benefit – i.e. accounting for renewable energy generation losses arising from impacts to other offshore developers, as well as potential new generation from the Project. It is also a matter of good design.
- 4.6 As outlined during ISH1, the necessary data and modelling tools to undertake such an analysis is available to the Applicant. Therefore, there are no impediments to the Applicant undertaking this required step. At the current stage of the development of the Project, the Applicant is best placed to understand the realistic scenarios for the Project, which can then be tested against the known positions of the existing assets.
- 4.7 In response to action point 26 of the action points arising from ISH1 (EV2-005), the Ørsted IPs reiterate there are a number of industry-recognised wake models which could be used to undertake this assessment.