

# Meeting note

<b>File reference</b>	<b>EN010007</b>
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Hannah Pratt
<b>Date</b>	21 April 2017
<b>Meeting with</b>	<b>Horizon Nuclear Power</b>
<b>Venue</b>	Teleconference
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>The Planning Inspectorate</b> Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Hannah Pratt (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor) Richard Kent (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor)  <b>Horizon Nuclear Power (the Applicant)</b> David Palmer (Savills) Sharon Woodruff (Jacobs)
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Update meeting on approach to Development Consent Order (DCO), Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA), and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

## Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

### Introduction

The Applicant and the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) case team introduced themselves and their respective roles. The Inspectorate continued by outlining its openness policy and ensured those present understood that any issues discussed and advice given would be recorded and placed on the Inspectorate's website under s51 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). Further to this, it was made clear that any advice given did not constitute legal advice upon which the Applicant (or others) can rely.

### ***Cumulative effects assessment***

The Applicant presented their approach to cumulative effects assessment and their list of reasonably foreseeable future projects. The Applicant also explained that the list of projects had been discussed with the Isle of Anglesey County Council (IACC) and the Inspectorate explained that evidence of agreement should be presented as part of the application. The Inspectorate advised that the Applicant may wish to consider applying a tiered approach to the assessment, as detailed within Planning Inspectorate advice note 17: Cumulative effects assessment. It also advised that thorough justifications should be provided when scoping out projects based on a lack of spatial and temporal overlap between projects; and that it would be useful to identify the distance of other projects from the Wylfa Newydd Project.

The Applicant explained that it did not consider it possible to include the proposed third Menai Bridge within the cumulative effects assessment due to the lack of information available on the project. The Inspectorate advised that this could be explained within the ES through application of the tiered approach. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that should any further information on the third crossing become available post submission of the application, it is prepared for questioning on potential cumulative effects during an examination.

### ***Proposed Environmental Statement structure***

The Applicant explained that the Environmental Statement (ES) would be split up geographically with separate volumes for the different areas of the proposed development. There would also be a volume within the ES considering project-wide effects. The Inspectorate stressed the importance of using consistent terminology in considering the effects resulting from the project as defined by the DCO project description, those that would occur from other Wylfa Newydd related projects (ie the A5025 on-line highway improvements, visitor and media centre and permanent housing), and those occurring cumulatively from other plans/projects. It also stressed the need to take care with terminology used to describe the different elements of the Wylfa Newydd Project as a whole and to ensure this is consistently applied.

### ***Major accidents***

The Applicant confirmed that whilst the ES will be produced based on The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009, they have taken note of the revised The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which require consideration of major accidents and disasters. The ES will contain an appendix which will consider the risks of accidents.

### ***Site preparation and clearance***

The Applicant explained that it intends to submit a Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) application to the IACC for the site preparation and clearance works in June 2017. It explained that the DCO would also include these works and that they would be assessed within the ES; however the Applicant suggested that the works may be removed from the DCO application during the examination should consent be granted under TCPA. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to justify this approach within their explanatory memorandum and to consider how this would work in practice. It was suggested that this should be included within the draft documents in order to allow the Inspectorate to provide comments during the pre-application stage.

### ***Pre-application consultation 3 (PAC3)***

The Applicant confirmed PAC3 would commence on 22 May 2017 and last for 30 days. The IACC had commented on the Applicant's draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) and requested an additional two weeks for comments. However the Applicant considers PAC3 to be a targeted consultation and explained they have had ongoing engagement within the IACC where they have presented the draft documents, therefore the consultation will not be unexpected.

The Inspectorate noted the Applicant would be consulting for the minimum statutory period, however advised the Applicant to consider extending the consultation period in

light of IACC's comments. The Inspectorate advised that should the consultation period not meet IACC's request, the Applicant should ensure the approach is fully justified within their consultation report. It was also noted this may be the first time for newly affected landowners to be statutorily consulted.

The Applicant was reminded of the need to notify the Inspectorate when PAC3 commences under section 46 of the PA2008.

### ***Scales of Plans***

The Inspectorate confirmed that the plans listed within Regulations 5(2) of the Infrastructure Planning (Application Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (as amended) should be submitted at a scale not smaller than 1:2500. However, it was agreed that plans within reports such as the ES do not need to meet these scale requirements, however should be of sufficient scale to be clearly legible.