

Meeting Note

File reference	EN010001
Status	Final
Author	Nik Perepelov

Meeting with	EDF, Somerset County Council (SCC), West Somerset District Council (WSDC), Sedgemoor District Council (SDC), Highways Agency (HA), Environment Agency (EA)
Meeting date	11 May 2011
Attendees (IPC)	Paul Hudson (Pre-application Commissioner) Mark Wilson (Case Leader) Helen Adlard (Director of Legal Services) (for part) Andrew Luke (EIA and Land Rights Adviser) Kath Powell (Case Officer) Nik Perepelov (Assistant Case Officer)
Attendees (non IPC)	Tim Norwood (EDF Energy) John Rhodes (Quod on behalf of EDF) Ian Bryant (EDF Energy) Mark Pollock (SCC) Alyn Jones (SCC) James Holbrook (WSDC) Mark Smith (ARUP representing WSDC and SDC) Doug Bamsey (SDC) Ron Davies (HA) Louisa McKay (EA) Brian Payne (EA)
Location	IPC offices, Bristol

Meeting purpose	Tripartite meeting to discuss various aspects of the proposed Hinkley 'C' scheme.
------------------------	--

Summary of key points discussed and advice given	<p>EDF Update on the scheme:</p> <p>An application for site preparation works (part of preliminary works) was made to WSDC in November 2010. A request for further environmental information was made by WSDC and EDF responded in April 2011. WSDC will run a consultation exercise on this additional information until May 20th. EDF hope the application will go to Committee in June, though WSDC have new members following the recent elections who will need training. WSDC confirmed that the June timetable is nevertheless achievable, though the status of the National Policy Statements (NPSs) is an issue. WSDC are seeking clarity from the Government on the timescales and likely amendments to the NPSs to help inform the recommendation and determination of</p>
---	--

the site preparation application. EDF and WSDC agreed that further discussion on whether the application would be sent to Committee without a designated NPS is needed, particularly once the interim Weightman Report (a report into the implications for the UK nuclear industry following the Fukushima nuclear power station incident) has been published.

An Order for a temporary jetty was made to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in December 2010. Just over 40 objections have been received. In addition, the MMO do not feel that they have jurisdiction to consent the closure of the harbour as part of any consent issued. This power may therefore need to be included in the DCO. Whilst EDF hope to resolve the objections without recourse to an inquiry they have nevertheless asked MMO to begin the proceedings to make the necessary arrangements should it be needed. Any inquiry is likely to be held in autumn / winter 2011. EDF hoped that this should not affect overall timescales for the project.

The objections submitted by the Local Authorities relate to a lack of information in some areas and are not objections in principle to the temporary jetty. Some of this information is being provided as part of the response to the request for further information in relation to the preliminary works, and EDF intend to submit further information to the MMO by mid-June. Further objections from pressure groups and anon have been received regarding the marine use and environmental implications for the intertidal zone.

EDF's stage '2A' consultation has now closed, with approximately 300 responses received. Key issues raised include transport, worker's shift patterns and property price guarantees. Relatively few responses related to the changes to the accommodation strategy. SDC were of the view that precisely because of the prevalence of transport issues, the public were less concerned with accommodation. The Council nevertheless believe that issues around accommodation remain (in particular in Innovia site) and reflected this in their joint consultation response, compiled with WSDC. SCC submitted a separate response and also highlighted transport and accommodation issues. EDF confirmed that it was intended that stage '2A' would be the last stage of formal (statutory) consultation.

EDF's application will comprise a large number of documents and it is hoped that the first draft of the full application will be ready in late June or early July 2011. EDF is discussing with the Local Authorities which are the priority documents that the bodies will need to have ahead of submission. IPC encouraged early discussion about the structure of the application. Experience of live applications has made the need for careful ordering of the application documents to be clear. In particular, the application itself should be clearly distinguished from the supporting

documents. A clear, logical structure to the application will mitigate the effects of having such a large application. EDF confirmed that they will include a guide to the application as one of the supporting documents. The size of the application may create difficulties for the IPC in terms of storage. Practical discussions with the IPC ahead of submission and sufficient notice will be needed.

EDF continue discussions with EA on the environmental permits. These relate to radioactive substances, combustion activity and water discharge. Applications for these are expected to be made this summer. EA are content that the information submitted so far does not suggest any likely hold-up to the granting of these permits, though much detail remains to be submitted and the impact of the water discharges on the European sites is likely to require attention. All parties agreed that interaction between the two parallel processes would be beneficial, and EDF were advised to try to line up the respective timescales as far as possible.

EA confirmed that events in Japan had impacted on the Generic Design Assessment process. Issuing a statement of design acceptability some time in 2012 remained a possibility, subject to the findings of the Weightman report.

The second draft of the Habitats Assessment Report is being compiled, following around three years of surveys and assessment work. The findings will be discussed in a series of workshops involving key parties. An internal deadline of the end of June for the final report has been set. EA are working closely with Countryside Council for Wales and Natural England on providing a combined response. IPC confirmed that their recent *Advice note ten: Habitats Regulations Assessment* did not introduce any requirements beyond those already discussed in previous meetings.

IPC welcomed SDC's, WSDC's and SCC's intention to submit a joint local impact report (LIR) and their proactive approach in beginning to compile the report early. The LIR should not repeat points made in the individual authorities' responses and should be kept short and concise and focus on the key local issues and concerns. SDC felt that some outreach beyond the three authorities would help inform the LIR. Any responses received by local authorities to their own engagement on the LIR have no direct role in the PA2008 process. If the raw responses or the feedback are to be used in conjunction with the LIR then they should be contained within the LIR and used to highlight issues and impacts that are identified in the Report.

A combined adequacy of consultation response from the authorities may also, as suggested, be beneficial. In due course the IPC will ask for an email address to send the request to on

the day of submission.

Topic based working groups on the topics to be covered by development consent obligations and the statement(s) of common ground continue. EDF were of the view that these discussions need to move beyond agreeing impacts and begin addressing proposals for mitigation. The local authorities are preparing their responses to the proposed planning obligations associated with the site preparation works. These will, in turn, inform their views on the development consent obligations. Obligations relating to both site preparation works and the main development may be included in the planning obligations for site preparation works. The situation with the NPSs, as discussed above, is also relevant to these discussions.

EDF are considering the need to address the implications of one or other of the various consents not being granted. The DCO will be drafted in a way to mitigate the risk of either of the other applications failing to get consent as far as possible. The situation will depend on exactly which consent (if any) is not in place and various solutions will be available. WSDC confirmed that they too are working these various scenarios through.

IPC advised that it was too early to establish whether applications for environmental permits in relation to site preparation works would be relevant to the main application.

Without prejudice to the decision of the Commissioner on whether or not the application can be accepted, decisions on venues for the preliminary meeting and any hearings need to be made early, especially as the area around the site is largely rural and unlikely to have venues capable of accommodating the numbers expected to show an interest in the application. Possible venues for depositing the application documents were discussed: the local authorities' offices and larger libraries were suggested, along with local parish councils which had proved useful during the course of the application for the preliminary works.

The question of who is empowered to discharge requirements remains open. EDF should draft their development consent order having due regard to s120 of the Planning Act 2008. The IPC are at present insufficiently resourced to perform this function and are in discussion with Government on this policy issue. The most recent publication on this matter (CLG's guidance to local authorities) anticipates that local authorities will perform this function. SDC confirmed that their preference is for local discharge of requirements by the various local planning authorities. EDF recognised that there may be options which it would need to consider further. EA confirmed that the resolution of this question was also relevant to their interests. IPC noted that this discussion underlined the need to provide comments to

	the applicant in drafting requirements.
--	---

Specific decisions/ follow up required?	IPC and the local authorities to discuss dates for future meetings. One final tripartite meeting will be held just ahead of submission. IPC to send EDF the correspondence received during stage 2A consultation.
--	---

Circulation List	Attendees