

## Inception Meeting Note

<b>File reference</b>	<b>EN010005 – Triton Knoll</b>
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	<b>Amy Cooper</b>

<b>Meeting with</b>	<b>RWE, MFA, Lincolnshire CC and East Lindsey DC</b>
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>11 February 2010</b>
<b>Attendees (IPC)</b>	Ian Collinson (IC), Kay Sully (KS), Amy Cooper (AC)
<b>Attendees (non IPC)</b>	<p><b>RWE Npower Renewables Limited (RWE NRL):</b>            Jacob Hain (JH)            Trevor Baker (TB)            Rob Gully (RG)</p> <p><b>Local Authorities:</b>            Neil Mc-Bride (NB) Lincolnshire CC            Chris Panton (CP) East Lindsey            Michelle Walker (MW) East Lindsey</p> <p><b>Others:</b>            Shaun Nicholson (SN) MFA            Alan Gibson (AG) MFA</p> <p>(Apologies for Ross Hodson, MFA, and Alan Freeman, Lincolnshire CC)</p>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Lincolnshire CC Offices, Titanic Works, Lincoln LN5 7JN</b>

<b>Meeting purpose</b>	<p><b>Inception meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain the roles and responsibilities of all attendees within the Development Consent process.</li> <li>• Understand key elements of the project</li> <li>• Establish what joint working has taken place so far and future liaison between promoter, LA and stat consultees.</li> <li>• Discuss outreach work.</li> </ul>
------------------------	---

## Summary of outcomes

IPC advised on its openness policy as well as the IPC not being able to discuss the merits of a project with any party. Referred to S.51 of the PA 2008 (publishing advice) and also to note that any advice given under S.51 does not constitute legal advice which can be relied upon.

Each stage of the planning process was discussed and the following points were raised/clarified:

- screening/scoping reports and opinions will be made accessible to the public from our website.
- Local authorities (LAs) become a consultee within the EIA scoping process.
- When LAs comment on the adequacy of community consultation, they do not have to audit the consultation undertaken. Advised LA's to examine sections 55, 42, 47 & 48 of Act.
- Although the MFA is not a statutory body to consult upon the SoCC, the IPC advise that the promoter invites the MFA to comment because this body has knowledge about the offshore community.
- The IPC will invite LAs to the preliminary meeting; each LA is best placed to judge how they wish to be represented. Some thought could be given to joint representation, especially as the preliminary meeting is primarily concerned with procedural matters. The IPC can provide further advice on this at the appropriate time. The Act states that there is scope for Examining body to invite other interested persons.
- The LA will be responsible for enforcing requirements. The MFA/MMO will only monitor/enforce deemed marine consents for activities in those areas of the sea that the MMO manages.

### **RWE Presentation (key points):**

Formal consultation:

A two stage consultation process will be undertaken:

- a) Currently 14 options for location of onshore substation.
- b) Full scheme consultation (including cabling route once substation location identified)

Indicative Timetable (subject to change):

Informal consultation ongoing since Aug 09

S46 Notification – W/C 15<sup>th</sup> Feb 10

SoCC formally released for comment – 15/16<sup>th</sup> Feb 10  
(Paper copy to be sent to LA's and IPC)

Formal S42 Consultation – W/C 22<sup>nd</sup> Feb 10

	<p><b>IPC Outreach Programme :</b></p> <p>A leaflet was distributed which summarised the programme of activities which the IPC would like to undertake for projects. IPC explained the aims and objectives of this work which is about explaining the new process and the opportunities for people to get involved. A key activity concerns a workshop where community groups are invited to learn more about the IPC and ask questions directly to IPC staff. It would not be an opportunity to discuss the merits of the application but it would be an informative session assisting parties in improving knowledge of the new process.</p> <p>Both RWE NRL and LAs support the objectives of the outreach work and encourage further discussions. RWE NRL felt that they should not be present at any public meetings run by the IPC, but would help to organise them.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Record of any advice given</b></p>	<p>LA concerned about magnitude of phone queries they are likely to receive regarding the new planning process. IPC advised that, wherever possible the LA should seek to engage with individuals or groups to explain the process. However more complex queries should be directed to the IPC.</p> <p>SoCC – LA asked if there is scope to vary the consultation period for providing comments to the applicant. IPC advised that it is for the applicant to determine when to publicise the SoCC following the end of the 28 days. It is in the applicant’s interests to ensure that both LA’s have commented on the draft SoCC. If each LA has a different timescale for commenting (e.g. due to committee reporting deadlines) they should advise the applicant accordingly.</p> <p>S42 Consultation – With regard to statutory consultees RWE NRL sought clarification on which level (national or local offices) to send correspondence to. IPC advised that it expects the applicant to establish who to write to through their contact so far. If in doubt they should write to both.</p> <p>Examination process - LA asked what scope is there to change the scheme once application submitted and accepted by the IPC? (e.g. changing of onshore sub station location).</p> <p>IPC advised that there is very little scope to amend a scheme during the examination process. The importance of front loading was emphasised, in terms of the need for LA to engage with the applicant to address any issues during pre-application. In terms of the off-shore elements this is a complex area. Some guidance is provided in the draft NPS on Renewables concerning flexibility within the</p>
--	---

	<p>'project envelope' (e.g. micro-siting for the wind turbines) provided this would not result in a change to the application. This would also be picked up in terms of the marine licensing requirements. IPC explained that it was important that RWE NRL and the MFA/MMO worked together on this to define what should go into the draft DCO.</p>
--	--

<b>Specific follow up action required?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further discussion between IPC, RWE NRL and LAs regarding timing of outreach work.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Circulation List</b>	Ian Collinson, Kay Sully, Tracey Page, Helen Adlard (IPC)
	Jacob Hain, Trevor Baker, Rob Gully (RWE NRL)
	Neil Mc-Bride (Lincolnshire CC)
	Chris Panton, Michelle Walker (East Lindsey)
	Shaun Nicholson, MFA