



Meeting note

File reference	EN010080
Status	Final
Author	Karl-Jonas Johansson
Date	17 January 2017
Meeting with	DONG Energy
Venue	Teleconference
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Tom Carpen (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Kay Sully (Case Manager) Karl-Jonas Johansson (Case Officer) Helen Lancaster (Senior EIA and Land Rights advisor) Katherine King (EIA and Land Rights Advisor)
	DONG Energy Stuart Livesey (Project Development Manager) Emily Woolfenden (Consultation Manager) Sophie Banham (Consents Manager) Alun Williams – (EIA specialist, RPS)
Meeting objectives	Hornsea Project Three monthly meeting update
Circulation	All attendees.

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

Introduction

The Applicant and the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) case team introduced themselves and their respective roles. The Inspectorate continued by outlining 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 s.51 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008). Further to this, it was made clear that any advice given did not constitute legal advice upon which the Applicant (or others) can rely.

The Inspectorate updated the Applicant on some changes in personnel in particular, that Tom Carpen will be taking on the Infrastructure Planning Lead role for all Transport case work and Chris White will be the Infrastructure lead for all Energy case work. Kay Sully was also introduced as the pre-application Case Manager.

It was highlighted that the notes from the previous meeting were still outstanding, the Inspectorate agreed to review comments after the close of the meeting with an aim of progressing these.

The Applicant offered to prepare draft notes for all future meetings for consideration by the Inspectorate to assist in producing notes. The Inspectorate thanked the Applicant for this and advised that whilst the Inspectorate is happy to receive such a note from the Applicant, the Inspectorate will decide on the final drafting to ensure open and transparent noting of meetings.

Project update

The Applicant gave a summary of the community consultation events conducted in October/November 2016 in locations across Norfolk.

The summary was based on the feedback given at the events and an online form on the Project website (www.dongenergy.co.uk/hornseaproject3). Most attendees expressed a wish to be kept informed about the Project and how it develops. To accommodate this, the Applicant intends to issue regular quarterly newsletters and will hold an additional round of community consultation events in March 2017. It was noted that these events were not included in the Statement of Community Consultation however the Applicant intends to advertise these additional events using the local media, the Project newsletter and Project website.

The feedback from the attendees was discussed and it was agreed that future Consultation Summary Reports (produced after each round of community consultation) could be clearer on how the feedback had influenced the Project. The Applicant advised that among the main issues identified by attendees were cumulative impact, traffic and environmental impacts from the project.

The Applicant intends to offer briefing sessions to the Local Authorities and Parish Councils prior to the next round of consultation, in a similar format to the last round however extending the offer to Parish Councils also. The Applicant explained that the latest community newsletter, containing details of the upcoming events had been sent to all the landowners along the refined corridor.

The option of including a draft Development Consent Order (DCO) with the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) was discussed. The Inspectorate advised that it might be preferable to explain in accessible / non-technical language how the findings and mitigation detailed in the Environmental Impact Assessment will be secured and implemented through the DCO rather than include a draft of it. The Applicant was also advised to keep an audit of requested changes to the DCO and to manage expectations. It was acknowledged by the Inspectorate that a change requested by one party may mean that a change requested by another cannot be accommodated.

Evidence plan

The Applicant provided an update in relation to the evidence plan. Expert group meetings are to be set up by the end of January/beginning of February 2017 using the scoping opinion to inform the meetings. This is to form part of the formal consultation to pull together the PEIR. The Applicant's intention is to provide draft Environmental

Impact Assessments wherever possible at this stage to enable comprehensive consultation.

There is also a Marine Conservation Zone meeting planned for Wednesday 1 February 2017.

Surveys

The Applicant intends to start onshore Phase 2 surveys including walkover surveys and geophysics in February 2017. As a result of the timings required for the survey work, the PEIR will be produced without all of this information. Ornithology and marine mammal surveys are ongoing offshore. The survey methodology for benthic ecology surveys will be discussed at the next meeting with the relevant stakeholders.

Scoping opinion feedback

The Applicant requested confirmation regarding references made in the Hornsea Three Scoping Opinion to the following points.

Paragraph 2.66: The Inspectorate clarified that its comments were not requesting a non-technical summary but a request for a section in the Environmental Statement (ES) to set out the context for the project. This could be achieved by using the Project Description chapter to clearly set out the project and its parameters and then the topic chapters are able to refer back to this to enable the parameters of any assessment to be understood.

Paragraph 2.74: The Applicant queried what was meant by the comment in the Scoping Opinion that alternatives should be assessed in the ES in relation to the grid connection.

The Inspectorate advised that while it was accepted that not all the route options discussed would have received the same degree of assessment as the final choice, the ES should explain how the Applicant has considered alternative grid connection routes, and what the factors were that influenced the final selection. The Triton Knoll Electrical Connection provided a useful example of the amount of questions the Examining Authority are likely to ask on this point. Furthermore, the relevant National Policy Statements should be reviewed in relation to their requirements of considered alternatives.

Paragraph 3.36: The Applicant queried why the Scoping Opinion did not accept that some aspects of the seascape assessment could be scoped out, given that this had been done for other offshore wind farms. The Inspectorate advised that in their view this was not the case the Applicant said they would re-consider this and raise further queries if required.

The Applicant also requested views on when you can, in collating information for the ES, employ a cut-off date for projects to take into account for cumulative impact assessment. The Inspectorate advised that it was a case-specific judgement and the Applicant would have to take a view it feels it can justify. Projects to be included should be agreed with Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies. Should updated information be required during examination, this should be brought to the Case Manager's attention as soon as possible for them to advise on procedural matters.

In addition, the Applicant was advised to include as much of its collected information in the application as possible to aid the smooth running of the examination.

Compulsory Acquisition

The Applicant has started discussions with landowners affected by the project with the aim of trying to agree private agreements. However, the draft DCO will contain compulsory acquisition powers in case agreements cannot be reached.

The Applicant was advised to try to identify issues around protective provisions and begin discussions as early as possible, recognising that this is not fully in the Applicant's control. The inspectorate advised that discussions over protective provisions tend to impact both on the examination and the decision period.

The Inspectorate asked whether the Applicant anticipated the need to use powers under s53 of PA2008. The Applicant advised that it was still considering whether there was a need, and would advise the Inspectorate if circumstances changed.

AOB

The list of local authorities identified for the purpose of the scoping report was discussed. The Inspectorate clarified that Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury District Councils were identified as affected local authorities due to parts of the shapefile including land in the jurisdiction of Breckland District Council.

It was agreed that the Inspectorate would review the Applicant's Habitats Regulation Assessment screening report.

The Inspectorate clarified that the transboundary screening was conducted by the Inspectorate and that the Applicant would be notified of the result.

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that it was exploring the possibility of entering into a Planning Performance Agreement with Norfolk County Council, North Norfolk District Council, Broadland District Council and South Norfolk District Council and had set up a meeting to discuss the prospect in more detail. The Inspectorate requested to be informed on the progress of matters in discussions with the local authorities as agreement on matters can be important matters in timetabling an examination.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- The Inspectorate to review the suggested amendments to the meeting note dated 1 December 2016;
- The Inspectorate to provide the Applicant with Highways England contacts;
- The Inspectorate to clarify whether Forest Heath and Bury St Edmunds should have been identified as affected by the project;
- The Applicant to discuss the possibility of joint working with the host local authorities; and
- The Inspectorate to look into the possibility of changing the February and August meetings to a different date.