



Meeting Note

File reference	EN010001
Status	Final
Author	Jack Wride

Meeting with	EDF Energy
Meeting date	14 November 2012
Attendees (Planning Inspectorate)	Mark Wilson (Principal Case Manger) Katherine Chapman (Case Manager) Jack Wride (Case Officer)
Attendees (non Planning Inspectorate)	Tim Norwood (Chief Planning Officer) Katy McGuinness (Environmental Planning Manager)
Location	Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, Bristol

Meeting purpose	Lessons learnt regarding administration of the Hinkley Point C application
------------------------	---

Summary of key points discussed and advice given	<p>The Planning Inspectorate advised that the meeting would look at the administrative handling of the application. Merits of the case or progress of the recommendation report would not be discussed.</p> <p>Outreach EDF noted the positive impact of the final series of pre-examination outreach events. They felt these were well timed to answer questions from the public.</p> <p>External Venues Both parties agreed on the importance of getting the correct venues for the meetings / hearings in terms of facilities, location and ability to effectively accommodate attendees.</p> <p>Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Discussion of the benefits of early engagement between participants for mapping out areas of agreement / disagreement. The Planning Inspectorate considered whether it would be worthwhile placing greater emphasis on the iterative style of the SoCG drafting process</p> <p>Deadlines EDF suggested that The Planning Inspectorate should look carefully at timing of deadlines that are in close proximity to each other. Measures to improve timetabling clarity, such as the deadline summary produced in the examination's latter half, were appreciated.</p>
---	--

	<p>Planning Inspectorate Webpage EDF feeding back into the Planning Inspectorate’s external survey / wider review of the National Infrastructure pages.</p> <p>Hearings EDF encourage publication of detailed agendas where possible in the run up to issue-specific hearings as this enabled all parties to be better prepared for the Panel’s questions.</p> <p>The advantages and disadvantages of the Development Consent Order (DCO) issue-specific hearings being placed before the other issue-specific hearings were discussed.</p> <p>EDF highlighted a possible tension between Interested Parties being asked by the Panel not to repeat points, but not to raise new issues. The need for effective communication to all Interested Parties about what issues could be raised at each type of hearing was discussed.</p> <p>Communications Protocol The Planning Inspectorate confirmed there were no issues with EDF circulating copies of their documents / comments directly to statutory consultees. It was stressed that documents should be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate first to allow their publication on the website and deposit locations as soon as practicably possible.</p> <p>DCO Requirements EDF noted the difficulty in getting comments from some bodies until they were formally requested from Panel. Planning Inspectorate will look at ways to encourage participants to proactively engage in a more timely way in this regard.</p> <p>Final Points EDF commented that they were being asked on a regular basis to provide advice, based on their own experience on the process, to other prospective applicants. They would endeavour to make sure that the lessons learnt on Hinkley would be provided as part of this advice.</p>
--	---

Specific decisions/ follow up required?	Feedback to be followed up through the refreshing of internal procedures where appropriate.
--	---

Circulation List	All attendees