

**Meeting Note**

<b>File reference</b>	<b>EN010001</b>
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	<b>Katherine Chapman</b>

<b>Meeting with</b>	<b>EDF Energy</b>
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>25 January 2012</b>
<b>Attendees (IPC)</b>	<b>Mark Wilson (Case Leader) Chris White (Case Manager) Katherine Chapman (Case Manager)</b>
<b>Attendees (non IPC)</b>	<b>Tim Norwood (EDF Energy) John Rhodes (Quod) Stephen Walls (EDf Energy) by phone</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>IPC Office, Temple Quay, Bristol</b>

<b>Meeting purpose</b>	<b>To discuss procedural arrangements for the Preliminary Meeting and the Examination</b>
------------------------	---

<b>Summary of key points discussed and advice given</b>	<p>The IPC advised that the meeting would be based upon practical arrangements for the Preliminary Meeting and Examination and would not be dealing with the content of relevant representations or the merits of the application.</p> <p>EDF gave feedback on their latest round of public events and explained that a model of the development is now available for viewing. IPC advised that the model is not brought to the Preliminary Meeting because this meeting should focus on process and not the merits of the application.</p> <p>Following the conclusion of the Relevant Representation period (23 January at 11.59pm), the IPC advised that it had received approximately 1200 relevant representations and are currently processing these. These will be made available for the public and EDF as soon practicable.</p> <p>EDF advised that the IPC should expect s.56, s.59 and Regulation 13 notices in line with the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) shortly. The IPC, once a panel has been appointed (s.65 PA 2008), will send a Regulation 6 (The Infrastructure Planning (Fees) Regulations 2010) letter requesting the pre-examination fee to EDF.</p> <p>The IPC explained the role of the Rule 6 and Rule 4 letters (The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010) and advised that past examples of these can be found on the IPC website. The IPC explained that the content of the Rule 6</p>
---	---

	<p>letter provides a draft list of preliminary issues and the draft timetable for the examination. The content of the letter can be commented on before the preliminary meeting by emailing the team on <a href="mailto:hinkleypointc@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk">hinkleypointc@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk</a>. These letters are sent to interested parties. The letter will also be published on the IPC's Hinkley Point C New Nuclear Power Station project page.</p> <p>EDF requested advice as to whether Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with all local Parish Councils were required. EDF also asked whether they should prepare and submit a response document to all the relevant representations when published.</p> <p>The IPC advised it is up to EDF at this stage as to their approach. However, the IPC is of the view that the preparation of SoCG is likely to be a more valuable task at this stage than the preparation of responses for relevant representations, as this may repeat the information contained in the consultation report already submitted as part of the application. EDF may wish to prepare full responses to written representations once they are made at the start of the examination, and at that point EDF can consider responding to the relevant representations made by interested parties who have not gone on to make a further written representation.</p> <p>In relation to the production of multiple SoCG with a number of bodies, the IPC suggested that there is certainly a need for a proportionate approach. These documents are expected in relation to the local authorities and the main statutory bodies and there is no harm in considering other relevant interested parties where EDF feel the resource can be justified. During the course of the examination the Examining Authority may request SoCG on particular issues of interest to them. The value of SoCG to the Examining Authority is primarily derived from their clarity and intent, and not their word count. In this context an exchange of correspondence can be as valuable as a large document.</p> <p>EDF requested advice as to whether barristers were required at the preliminary meeting and examination.</p> <p>The IPC advised that the meetings are inquisitorial rather than adversarial. Therefore it is not envisaged that a barrister will be required at all sessions. However, the presence of a barrister is a decision to be taken by the applicant and is not a matter on which the IPC can advise.</p>
--	--

<b>Specific decisions/ follow up required?</b>	Liaison with EDF on preliminary meeting arrangements to continue.
--	---

<b>Circulation List</b>	All