

Environment, Development and Transport Committee

Item No.

Report title:	Hornsea Project Three offshore Wind Farm and onshore supporting infrastructure – submitted application.
Date of meeting:	6 July 2018
Responsible Chief Officer:	Tom McCabe - Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services
Strategic impact The above offshore windfarm and onshore grid connection infrastructure will be determined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008. Norfolk County Council is a statutory consultee on such projects and therefore has the opportunity to comment and influence the final decision. Responding to such consultations will ensure the County Council's views are formally taken into account prior to a final decision being made by the Secretary of State.	

Executive summary

Consultation by the Planning Inspectorate on a proposal by Orsted (Danish Energy Company) for an offshore wind farm 120 km off the Norfolk coast and ancillary onshore supporting infrastructure including: buried cable route (53 km); a booster station (if required); and a convertor station/substation (adjacent to Norwich Main). The proposal has a generating capacity of 2.4 million Giga Watts, which is sufficient to provide 2 million homes with electricity. Given the scale of the development it is deemed to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and will be determined by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

This is a formal Development Consent Order (DCO) application consultation under Section 56 of the Planning Act 2008. This is the final opportunity to make any formal representations on the merits of the proposal prior to the statutory Examination, although the County Council will have an opportunity to submit a Local Impact Report (LIR) under S60 (3) of the Act ahead of the Examination. Members will recall that this Committee made detailed comments on the pre-application in September 2017.

While the broad principle of this proposal is consistent with National Policy on renewable energy there are a number of detailed issues in respect of highway matters; and flood risk management, which will need to be resolved ahead of any final decision on the DCO.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that this Committee inform the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State that the County Council:

- (1) Broadly supports the principle of this offshore renewable energy proposal, which is consistent with national policy, subject to the detailed comments set out in this report being resolved satisfactorily through the DCO process;**
- (2) Has a series of holding highway objections to the proposed onshore infrastructure (see Appendix 1);**
- (3) Seeks a number of / "Requirements" (conditions) relating to highway; flood risk; and archaeological matters being agreed and attached to any final DCO decision (see Appendix 1).**

1. Proposal

- 1.1. This is a DCO application for an offshore windfarm and onshore ancillary grid

connection infrastructure in Norfolk, which will be determined by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. The application is defined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008.

- 1.2. Members will recall that the pre-application version of this proposal was considered by this Committee in September 2017. This Committee broadly supported the proposal subject to a number of detailed matters being resolved (see Assessment Section below).
- 1.3. The DCO application is now being handled by the Planning Inspectorate under Section 56 of the above Act. This is the final opportunity to respond to the DCO application ahead of the formal Examination process and a response will facilitate the Council's involvement in the Examination process should this be necessary. The County Council will also, however, be able to submit a Local Impact Assessment (LIR) under S60(3) of the Act ahead of the Examination providing further details and evidence in respect of the application's overall impact on the County Council's function.
- 1.4. The County Council is a statutory consultee and can make comments on the DCO Application and the supporting Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) / Environmental Statement (ES).
- 1.5. Members should be aware that the applicant has changed its name from DONG (Danish Oil and Natural Gas) to Orsted.
- 1.6. The proposal for the Hornsea Project Three Wind Farm is broadly similar to the pre-application version and comprises:

(a) Offshore

Location and Distance Offshore	:	Located between 121 km off the Norfolk Coast and 160 km off the Yorkshire Coast (see Appendix 2).
Total Site Area	:	696 sq.km. (29 km by 35 km)
Proposed Capacity	:	Installed capacity of 2.4 Giga-Watt (sufficient to supply 2 million households with electricity).
Number and size of turbines	:	Up to 300 turbines with a tip height of up to 250 metres; or 160 turbines with maximum height of 325 metres;
Offshore works	:	Offshore export cable corridor (length of up to 163 km, width of up to 1.5 km) – 6 subsea export cables with length of individual export cable (including within array area) of 191 km.
	:	12 x Offshore transformer sub-stations platforms – topside main structure length and width of 90 m, topside ancillary structure length and width of 100 m and topside height excluding helideck or lightning protection 70 m;
	:	4 x Offshore HVDC (High Voltage Direct Current) Converter substation 180m x 90m x height 100 m (excluding helideck or lightning protection); or
	:	4 x Offshore HVAC (High Voltage Alternating Current) booster stations – topside main structure length and width of 90 m, topside ancillary structure length and width of 100 m and topside height 70 m (excluding helideck or lightning protection). This infrastructure could also be sub-sea(on the sea bed) – 6 x Offshore subsea HVAC booster stations – 50 m x 50 m x height 15m above seabed;
	:	Up to 3 accommodation platforms for construction and

		maintenance staff (150 operation staff) located within Array Area – 60 m x 60 x height 64 m.
--	--	--

(b) Onshore Work

Landfall Location	:	Weybourne – all associated permanent infrastructure will be located underground (see Appendix 3);
HVAC Booster Station HVAC scenario only (if required)	:	<p>Required if electricity brought ashore using HVAC technology within approx. 10 km of landfall.</p> <p>Proposed site located at Little Barningham (between Edgefield and Saxthorpe (see Appendix 4)</p> <p>HVAC Booster station likely to comprise:</p> <p>Single (length 120 m x width 75 m); or multiple building(s) up to 6 buildings (60 m x 40 m, per building). There may also be smaller adjacent buildings (control rooms etc.).</p> <p>Maximum height of all buildings 12.5 m (excl. lightning protection at 17.5 m).</p> <p>Site maximum footprint 30,407 sq.m. Plus temporary area for construction works (25,000 sq.m.) (NB the decision on whether to use HVAC or HVDC will be made after the project is consented.).</p> <p>Construction duration: 24 months;</p>
Cable route		<p>Buried cable route between Weybourne and grid connection at Norwich Main National Grid Substation (53 km) – (See Appendix 3).</p> <p>The cable corridor will typically be 80 metres in width (60 m permanent easement) – containing between 11 – 18 cables (HVDC-HVAC); 120 horizontal Directional Drillings per construction phase</p> <p>Installation – 30 months</p>
Grid Connection		Switch transfer electricity from the wind farm into the grid (400 kv). The proposed substation will be located adjacent to the Norwich Main National Grid Substation – (see Appendix 5).
Grid Connection – infrastructure: (see Appendix 5) HVDC Converter; or HVAC substation	:	<p>A new onshore substation will be required with a footprint of up to 149,302 sq.m plus temporary construction area (91,000 sq.m.); Maximum building height of 25 metres (excl. lightning protection at 30 m).</p> <p>HVAC scenario – up to 3 main buildings - length 150 m x width 75 per building. Or single building 250 m x 75 m per building (maximum height 15 m).</p> <p>HVDC scenario - 2 buildings - 220 m x 75 (maximum height 25 m).</p> <p>Duration of construction 36 months</p>
Landscaping	:	Strategic landscaping to mitigate adverse effects of the operation of the HVAC booster station, HVDC converter/HVAC substation (see Appendix 4 and 5);
Ancillary Works will include	:	Temporary main, secondary and HDD construction compounds and storage areas – i.e. including welfare facilities and hard standing. Main compound (see

	<p>Appendix 3) - up to 40,000 sq.m.</p> <p>Construction of temporary haul roads, access tracks, ramps and means of access and footpaths;</p> <p>Bunds, embankments, swales, landscaping, fencing and boundary treatments;</p> <p>Habitat creation;</p> <p>Works for the provision of apparatus including cabling, water and electricity supply works, foul drainage provision, surface water management systems and culverting;</p> <p>Landscaping and other works to mitigate any adverse effects of the construction,</p> <p>Archaeological and ground investigation works;</p> <p>Improvements to highway verges;</p> <p>Highway and private access roads;</p> <p>Works to move main sewers, drains; and cables;</p> <p>Works affecting non-navigable rivers, streams or water courses ;and</p> <p>Works for the benefit or protection of land affected by the authorised project.</p>
Construction Phasing	:
<p>Onshore works due to start in 2021, or as early as 2020, subject to making of DCO. Scheme could be split into two sequential (with or without gap) or overlapping phases. Maximum durations for each element will never exceed those stated for a single phase e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HVAC Booster station – maximum construction duration of 2 years for single phase; maximum duration of 5 years if two phases, comprising 2 years total construction with a 3 year gap); • HVDC converter/HVAC substation - maximum construction duration of 3 years for single phase; maximum duration of 6 years if two phases, comprising three years construction with a 3 year gap; • Onshore cable route – maximum construction duration of 2.5 years for single phase; maximum duration of 5.5 years for two phases, comprising 2.5 years construction with 3 year gap. <p>Maximum construction period for onshore works is 8 years assuming two phases with 3 year gap in between.</p>	

The EIA indicates that there are a range of transmission options involving using either: (a) High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC); or (b) High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC). Traditionally HVAC systems have been used in the UK for transmission as the technology is readily available and cheaper. However, HVDC technology is developing and becoming more economically viable. A HVDC solution would remove the need for both offshore and onshore Booster Stations. Hornsea Project Three may use HVAC or HVDC. The EIA shows the maximum infrastructure requirements needed (i.e. a worse case) for each topic of the EIA which may be based on either HVDC or HVAC technology depending on the receptor.

2. Evidence

- 2.1. The principal role of the County Council in responding to the above wind farm and ancillary onshore infrastructure application, is in respect of the Authority’s statutory role as:
- Highways Authority;
 - Minerals and Waste Planning Authority;
 - Lead Local Flood Authority; and
 - Public Health responsibilities.
- 2.2. In addition the County Council has an advisory environmental role and economic development function, which also needs to feed into any response made to the above windfarm proposal.
- 2.3. Other statutory consultees include:

Natural England	Highways England
Historic England	Drainage Boards
Marine Management Organisation	Public Health England
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	Energy and utility companies with cable and pipeline interests
Civil Aviation Authority	Parish, District and other County Councils

- 2.4. The remainder of this section of the report assesses the EIA Environmental Statement in respect of the County Council’s key functions and sets out the Authority’s proposed response / comments. The response largely relates to the onshore infrastructure required to connect the electricity generated to the National Grid. The attached Appendix provides more detailed County Council comments; holding objections and proposed planning conditions/requirements.

ASSESSMENT of the Environmental Statement (ES)

Overview

- 2.5. The assessment below follows the same format as with the earlier consultation, which this Committee considered in September 2017 and addresses the points / issues previously raised by this Authority. The proposal is largely the same as set out at the pre-application (S42) stage, although there have been focussed “minor” changes to the onshore cable route and further details on proposed mitigation and design matters.
- 2.6. The proposal has a maximum capacity of 2.4 Giga Watts (2,400 MW) of electricity, sufficient to power approximately 2 million households (i.e. this represents almost five times as many dwellings in Norfolk (2011)). Current operational offshore capacity in the UK is just over 4 GW (2015), therefore if consented the Hornsea proposal would potentially increase the UK’s installed capacity by 60%.
- 2.7. The proposal will generate forty times more energy than the Scroby Sands wind farm (60 MW) and more than seven times more energy than the Sheringham Shoal wind farm (317 MW). As such the proposal would contribute to the Government’s Renewable Energy targets and objectives (see Section 5 below).

Comment

- 2.8. The principle of this offshore renewable energy proposal should continue to be supported as it is consistent with national renewable energy targets and objectives, subject to the detailed comments, holding objections; and proposed planning conditions below being resolved.

Electricity Supply Issues –

(a) Transmission Alternatives

- 2.9. The applicant is continuing to pursue both options in respect of HVAC and HVDC. The ES acknowledges that both transmission types have a range of relative benefits and drawbacks. The main advantage of using HVDC would be that this removes the need for a Booster Station at Little Barningham. Orsted have indicated that they require flexibility in transmission system choice “to ensure anticipated changes in available technology and project economics can be accommodated within the scheme design and will make a decision during the detailed design phase post consent.”

Comment – the County Council’s preferred option would be for Orsted to pursue a HVDC solution which would overcome the need for a HVAC Booster Station, but recognises that the HVDC convertor station at Swardeston would have a greater height than the HVAC option.

(b) Grid Connection

- 2.10. Orsted have indicated to officers that the transfer of electricity from the National Grid to the local network, or the current capacity of the local transmission network is beyond the projects control. Orsted understands that UK Power Networks (UKPN) has demand feeder connections at Norwich Main, which already supply the local area with power. Therefore any power produced by Hornsea Three and injected into Norwich Main 400kV substation, will feed into both local demand (through these feeders) and the National transmission system, as this is the nature of electrical interconnection.

Comment – welcome the flexibility within this application to allow for electricity generated to feed into the local network (from Norwich Main) but consider that Orsted should pursue with National Grid and UKPN the opportunities for a secondary interconnection along the cable route in order to supply electricity where it may potentially be required to support housing and employment growth.

Socio-Economic Issues

- 2.11. As previously reported there are potentially significant economic benefits that may arise from the Hornsea proposal in terms of:

- Local employment creation;
- Business sectors affected by construction; and
- Operations and Maintenance (O&M) of the wind turbines.

- 2.12. The ES indicates that during the construction phase up to 880 jobs (Full Time Equivalents – FTE) could be supported and that a further 1,290 jobs (FTE) could be supported during the Operations and Maintenance phase. However, Orsted has indicated that the selection of a port for construction and operation will only be made post consent. In the meantime they will...

“explore the ability to use port facilities along the East Coast but are likely to use more than one port during construction, and cannot as yet ascertain where they would site an operations and maintenance base. A decision on which port to use will not be made until detailed discussions have taken place with potential suppliers, at a stage where they have a greater understanding of where the various components will come from and port capabilities.”

Comment

- 2.13. It is felt that the County Council should continue to work pro-actively with Orsted to demonstrate the economic benefits of using the Port facilities at Great Yarmouth

for:

- Construction; assembly and manufacture of windfarm components; and
- Operations and maintenance.

Wider Community Issues and Impact on business

- 2.14. Orsted have indicated that they have established voluntary Community Benefit Funds (CBFs) for a number of their projects, which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area, by supporting projects such as community building improvements and recreation facilities, conservation and wildlife projects etc. It is understood that Hornsea Project Three will review the interactions of the project, as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. However, any decision to establish a CBF for Hornsea Project Three would be made post financial investment decision (FID), when the Project has been given the green light to go ahead.
- 2.15. **Comment** – welcome the commitment towards establishing a Community Benefit Fund and would ask Orsted to ensure all stakeholders/communities are made aware of such funds and have the opportunity to make appropriate bids.
- 2.16. Compensation to businesses –the applicant has indicated that the Project has committed to reducing the number of construction phases from three to two, which has subsequently resulted in a reduced maximum construction duration onshore from 11 years to 8 years. In respect to compensation, Orsted will compensate landowners who are directly affected by the cable route through their land. Compensation is paid for the freehold depreciation of the land affected by the easement and for all reasonable and substantiated losses arising from construction of the project.
- 2.17. **Comment** – while welcoming the reduction in construction duration, it is felt that Orsted should commit to providing appropriate compensation for businesses and communities adversely affected by the construction works.

Commercial Fishing

- 2.18. The ES recognises that there will a number of potential impacts on commercial fisheries associated with the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of the Hornsea Three project. These include, for example, potential reductions in access to fishing grounds; increased fishing pressure elsewhere; additional steaming times; and potential for gear snagging. These impacts are described as “moderate adverse” in the ES in respect of construction and decommissioning for UK potting vessels.
- 2.19. To overcome these impacts Orsted propose the following mitigation:
- Advance warning and accurate location details of construction operations;
 - Associated safety zones and advisory distances;
 - On-going liaison with all fishing fleets; and
 - Disturbance payments.

Comment

- 2.20. Welcome the proposed mitigation and compensation measures set out in the ES and would ask that Orsted continue to work closely with the fishing community in order to minimise any potential impacts particularly during construction and decommissioning.

Local Highway Issues

- 2.21. Detailed discussions and negotiations will remain on-going throughout the application process particularly in respect of any temporary road closures; construction traffic management plans; and other travel related planning.

Notwithstanding these ongoing discussions officers have assessed the traffic implications arising from all of the following:- the landfall area; onshore cable corridor; booster station; connection to the National Grid; compounds; storage areas; and construction accesses – as used by (and or affected by) construction; operational and decommissioning traffic.

- 2.22. The application includes a Transport Assessment (TA) submitted in accordance with DfT guidance. Proposed HGV routes have been identified and acceptable restrictions have been offered to avoid adverse impact on sensitive receptors for example schools. Where practical the routes seek to utilise trunk; principal; and main distributor roads. Lower classification routes are only intended to be used where no other realistic alternatives are available.
- 2.23. Up to two temporary haul roads will be constructed to enable vehicles to move along the cable corridor, thereby relieving the need for construction traffic to make longer journeys on the highway network. Where the cable corridor crosses main distributor roads, horizontal directional drilling will be used to avoid unacceptable disruption to traffic on the highway network.
- 2.24. While the TA addresses a number of highway matters there remains a number of serious issue/concerns, which are yet to be resolved with the Highway Authority relating to HGV access arrangements at:
- (a) Temporary Construction sites (e.g. along the cable route) requiring appropriate highways conditions;
 - (b) The HVAC Booster Station (Little Barningham); and HVDC Converter Station / HVAC Substation (Norwich Main) – holding highway objection proposed on highway safety grounds; and
 - (c) The proposed main compound at the former Oulton Airfield (see Appendix 3) - holding highway objection proposed on highway safety grounds.
- (See Appendix below for details).
- 2.25. In addition further highway comments relating to: damage to the highway; abnormal loads; cumulative impact; and travel plans are set out in the Appendix.

Local Highway Comments

- 2.26. As a consequence of these outstanding highway access issues the County Council will need to raise a series of holding highway objections; and require a condition (known as a “requirement”) be imposed on the DCO requiring an up to date Construction Traffic Management Plan (see Appendix).

Wider Strategic Highway Issues

- 2.27. The proposed cable route passes to the west of Norwich and as such the County Council had previously raised issues concerning the proposed dualling of the A47 (T) between Easton and North Tuddenham; and the County Council’s prioritised creation of the Norwich Western Link. It is understood that the applicant has been working closely with Highways England to ensure that their proposal (cable route) does not fetter any future plans for the proposed dualling of the A47 (T). In addition the applicant has also been working closely with the County Council on the potential Western Link Road.
- 2.28. **Comment** – It is felt that Orsted should continue to work closely with both Highways England and Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority to ensure that the proposed cable route does not fetter any future plans for the strategic highway network to the west of Norwich.

Minerals and Waste

- 2.29. Orsted have worked closely with the County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. The County Council considers that the Environmental Statement adequately addresses minerals and waste issues and as such does not have any objection as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority

Comment

- 2.30. While the County Council does not have any minerals and waste planning concerns at this stage it is felt that the applicant should continue to work closely with the County Council as the application is progressed through to Examination.

Flood and Drainage Issues –Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)

- 2.31. The ES has assessed the risk from all sources of flooding and sets out proposed surface water strategies for the HVAC booster station at Little Barningham, the HVDC converter / HAVC substation near Swardeston and the onshore cable corridor study areas. If the infrastructure is considered to be crucial national infrastructure or strategic infrastructure then the LLFA would suggest that the development ensures that it is not at risk of the 0.1% annual probability flood event. This would include the proposed SuDS and associated drainage network. The majority of the project lies within areas of low risk of surface water flooding of 1 in 1000 (0.1% annual probability) flood event as shown in the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps, except in the locations where the cable corridor crosses main rivers and ordinary watercourses.

- 2.32. **Comment** – the LLFA welcome that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) have been proposed for the project where permanent above ground infrastructure is proposed to mitigate against additional impermeable surfaces creating an additional risk of flooding. Having considered the submitted documents, the LLFA are pleased to see that strategies have been supplied for the HVAC booster station and the HVDC converter / HAVC substation study areas. The cable corridor has not been considered in the drainage strategy due to the fact that the cable would be below ground and reinstatement to pre development state would mitigate the potential for increased runoff.

- 2.33. **Construction compounds** - It is noted that stockpiled material and construction compounds are proposed to be located outside of the floodplain (where possible), and as such have not been included in the study areas.

Comment - it is suggested that additional information regarding these areas is provided in the flood risk assessment and drainage strategy.

- 2.34. **Watercourses** - The Environmental Statement states that the crossing of ordinary watercourses would be by Horizontal Directional Drilling, open cut, temporary bridges or culverts. It is noted that all Norfolk County Council ordinary watercourses are proposed to be crossed by Horizontal Directional Drilling for permanent works and hence no consent from Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority is required. If this changes, or any other temporary works proposed as part of this project are likely to affect flows in an ordinary watercourse, then the applicant would need the approval of Norfolk County Council. Other ordinary watercourse crossings would need consent approval from the relevant Internal Drainage Board (IDB).

- 2.35. **Comment** - Norfolk County Council appreciates that these are initial drainage proposals, however ideally the matters above (infiltration testing and drainage design) should be clarified prior to determination, to ensure that the site has a deliverable surface water drainage strategy. In particular there is no maintenance or management strategy supplied with the application and the LLFA have to assume that the applicant will take responsibility for maintaining the drainage for the lifetime of development.

- 2.36. **Comments continued** – The LLFA will require a series of issues to be resolved ahead of commencement, including, for example: detailed infiltration testing; detailed design modelling calculations; design of drainage structures; a

maintenance and management plan etc. These issues can be addressed through a pre-commencement condition (see Appendix) attached to a DCO.

- 2.37. On-going discussions will continue throughout the DCO process between LLFA officers and the applicant.

Public Health

- 2.38. The County Council would expect detailed matters relating to construction noise and local environmental health to be addressed by the relevant District Councils. Providing the District Councils are satisfied with the proposal in relation to the above matters, the County Council would not wish to raise any public health concerns at this time.

Local Member Views

- 2.39. The Local County Council Member for Melton Constable has made the following comments:
- 2.40.
 - Welcomes the fact that an experienced and respected developer has invested significant time and money preparing this proposal, which will help the UK reduce its reliance on carbon energy;
- 2.41.
 - Considers it is vital that local people's concerns are listened to, in terms of the effects of the proposed development on their lives, and the steps that could be taken to mitigate them;
- 2.42.
 - Mitigating the impact on work, life and the environment must be paramount, and no expense spared;
- 2.43.
 - It is essential that any application for which consent is granted must contribute strategically to the local area as well;
- 2.44.
 - Would like to see the developer propose ways in which the proposed development will benefit the local community in terms of infrastructure in the long term - be that through improved transport, digital infrastructure or otherwise.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1. Staff have engaged with the applicant at the technical scoping stage; attending steering group and topic based meetings and provided technical advice and information in respect of the County Council's statutory responsibilities. The County Council has charged for some of this advice and technical data provided.

4. Issues, risks and innovation

- 4.1. The County Council is a statutory consultee on any Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project determined by the Secretary of State within Norfolk or on the borders with Norfolk. The County Council will also be invited to submit a Local Impact Report (LIR), the content of which is a matter for the Local Authority and can include local transport issues and the local area characteristics.
- 4.2. The Council's functions are subject to the public sector equality duties. However this report concerns a consultation response and no equality impact assessment issues have been identified at this stage.
- 4.3. The proposed internal procedures will allow for corporate response/s to be made to NSIP consultations ensuring all the County Council's statutory responsibilities are taken into account.

5. Background

- 5.1. At a national level the key energy objectives are:
- Reducing greenhouse gases (carbon reduction);

- Providing energy security; and
- Maximising economic opportunities.

In order to meet these objectives more infrastructure is required with an increased emphasis on energy generation from renewable and low carbon sources.

- 5.2. The government's long term aspiration is to increase the diversity of the electricity mix, thereby improving the reliability of energy supplies as well as lowering carbon emissions. The Government is committed to the following targets by 2030:
- A 40% cut in greenhouse gas emissions compared to 1990 levels;
 - At least a 27% share of renewable energy consumption; and
 - At least 27% improvement in energy efficiency.

- 5.3. The Energy Act 2013 includes provision intended to incentivise investment in low carbon electricity generation, ensure security of supply and help the UK meet its emissions reduction and renewable energy targets. The Climate Change Act 2008 underlines the government's commitment to addressing both the causes and consequences of climate change. The Act aims to improve carbon management and help the transition towards a low carbon economy in the UK. The Planning Act 2008 also makes specific reference to the need for local authorities to tackle climate change.

- 5.4. In terms of planning the UK's commitment to renewable energy has been captured in the following National Policy Statements (NPSs):
- Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN 1);
 - NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN 3);
 - NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN 5).

The Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to have regard to the relevant NPSs when making their decision.

- 5.5. With regard to local planning issues the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012) indicates that the planning system has a key role in supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. To help increase the use and supply of renewable energy the NPPF (section 10) indicates, inter alia, that local planning authorities (LPAs) should:
- Have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources;
 - Design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon development;
 - Consider identifying suitable areas for renewable development and supporting infrastructure.

- 5.6. As the above proposal is a NSIP it will be the Secretary of State (SoS) rather than the respective LPAs who will determine the application. The SoS will need to have regard to Local Plan policies and allocations when determining the application. The individual LPAs, including the County Council, are also statutory consultees in the NSIP process and will respond having regard to their Local Plan policies and other statutory responsibilities including environmental health (District Councils).

Background Papers

The Planning Act (2008)

(<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/29/contents>)

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) -

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Energy Act (2013)

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2013/32/contents/enacted/data.htm>

Hornsea Project Three – Environmental Statement and other supporting documents

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper or want to see copies of any assessments, eg equality impact assessment, please get in touch with:

Officer name : Stephen Faulkner

Tel No. : 01603 222752

Email address : stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.