



Meeting note

Project name	Hornsea Project Four
File reference	EN010098
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	18 April 2019
Meeting with	Orsted Hornsea Project Four Limited
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Meeting objectives	Project Update Meeting
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 updated the Inspectorate on the progress of the project. The Applicant explained that it will connect at the same site as the National Grid Sub-station at Creyke Beck, it had a formal connection offer which has been accepted.

The Applicant said it was in the process of refining the export cable corridor. At scoping they had presented an indicative permanent 200 metre export cable corridor (ECC), which runs from landfall to the Hornsea Four Onshore Substation (OnSS) which they have now refined down to a permanent 80 metre ECC. Hornsea Four will require an additional cable to connect to National Grid Creyke Beck. This cable will be within a 40-metre corridor. The Applicant also spoke about how it had refined landfall areas based on feedback from parish councils and local landowners.

Furthermore, it had reduced the area of the onshore substation search from that shown in the Scoping Opinion of October 2018, then split the remaining area into 4 zones. The Applicant explained how it was replicating the practices of the Dogger Bank offshore windfarms in forming local consultation groups, specifically an Onshore Substation Consultation Group has been established. The Inspectorate queried who would be involved in these groups. The Applicant replied that initially it had been just Parish Councils, which had then suggested the addition of local interest groups such as the Ramblers and local wildlife groups.

The Applicant reiterated the role of the community liaison officer, mentioned in the last meeting between the Inspectorate and the Applicant, who will be acting as a point of contact in the local community and contacting hard to reach rural communities in East Riding. The Inspectorate noted the benefit of a single point of contact for the local community. The Applicant continued to refine its approach to consultation. It mentioned a design and vision document which aimed to give people an opportunity to interactively engage with the substation design to try and set the development of the substation within the context of its location. The Inspectorate checked to ensure this would operate within National Grid's safety requirement, the Applicant confirmed this.

The Inspectorate asked about the status of the design and vision document. The Applicant answered that a high-level document would be produced for consultation and then the results of it would be set out in the Environmental Statement (ES). The Inspectorate and the Applicant agreed that incorporating good design early on was positive.

The Applicant then gave an update on the offshore area. It explained how, by reducing the area they leased, they could reduce correlation with the known distribution of key bird species by 54%. This would be secured through the Order Limits. The Applicant mentioned that this had been shown to Natural England and The Crown Estate, that

engagement with the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds had been good, and development potential was not significantly hampered.

The Inspectorate asked about impacts on ports and shipping. The Applicant replied that it had held meetings with the Marine Management Organisation and Trinity House, had undertaken winter surveys and had met with DFDS Shipping, a key stakeholder. The Applicant explained it was aiming to maintain contingency with Hornsea 2, however it understood shipping was a key constraint.

The Applicant and Inspectorate discussed the approach being taken to Habitats Regulation Assessment, particularly in regard to the risk to birds and Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest. The Applicant said it did not favour this option, and the work to reduce the developable area had significantly reduced the risk of IROPI.

Proportionality in Environmental Impacts Assessment (EIA)

The Applicant set out its proportional approach, explaining how it aimed to provide an EIA which met legal and consenting requirements. While also being suitably brief and providing an adequate assessment of likely significant effects. The Applicant explained it had done this through the evidence plan process and through splitting effects into non-significant effects, minor significant effects and likely significant effects. The former two will be scoped out where agreed with the Planning Inspectorate and relevant statutory consultee.

The Applicant said it had then re-assessed these against scoping opinions and made judgements about what was needed to resolve differences in opinions. Through this it had decided what needed a high detail assessment and what needed a low detail assessment. The Inspectorate asked whether the mitigation methods for those things which only had a low detail assessment would be secured within the Development Consent Order (DCO). The Applicant confirmed this was the case.

The Applicant further explained that it would provide a commitments register and the impact and effects register as annexes to the ES. Its aim was for the ES to only include those things that they can't mitigate or avoid. Everything else will be secured through the commitments register and associated DCO documents

The Inspectorate noted Historic England's concerns about unknown historic underwater architecture being scoped out and clarified its position that this had been scoped out because mitigation had already been agreed. The Applicant and the Inspectorate discussed issues of engagement between the Applicant and Historic England. The Inspectorate offered to help if possible.

S42 Consultation

The Applicant mentioned it was planning to use Commonplace, an online tool used by Highways England, in its consultation. It also spoke about using interactive maps. The Inspectorate asked for feedback on how these have worked so it could develop its own consultation processes. The Applicant noted that the Preliminary Environmental

Information (PEIR) would be ready by the end of July and therefore this is when consultation would begin.

The Applicant queried the need to provide consultation documents in hard copy. The Inspectorate advised that it should consider the risks and seek its own legal advice. The Applicant asked whether it could use Orsted 9.5 point font, The Inspectorate referred to guidance that recommended font of a certain size. **Post meeting note:** [Government accessible communication formats guidance](#)

AOB

The Applicant noted that they are having issues in relation to land access to conduct surveys, however they hope this will be resolved before the end of May.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- Arrange another meeting for the end of May or Early June