



Meeting note

File reference	EN010007
Status	Final
Author	Siân Evans
Date	7 June 2017
Meeting with	Horizon Nuclear Power
Venue	Temple Quay House
Attendees	<p>Planning Inspectorate Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Kay Sully (Case Manager) Siân Evans (Case Officer) Hannah Pratt (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor) Richard Kent (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor) Pauleen Lane (Group Manager) (part attendance)</p> <p>Horizon Nuclear Power David Palmer (DCO Manager) Bryony Stocking (EIA Specialist) Alex Herbert</p>
Meeting objectives	Wylfa Newydd Project update meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

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.

The Applicant advised that they are mid-way through stage 3 of their pre-application consultation. This is the final consultation and will end on 22 June 2017. The Isle of Anglesey County Council (IoACC) and Natural Resources Wales have requested an additional two weeks to make comments. The Inspectorate reiterated its concerns about the timetable for submission and advised the Applicant to ensure they have sufficient time to take consultation responses into account before submitting draft documents to the Inspectorate for review. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that it is in their interest to ensure the application is as well prepared as possible in advance of submission to ensure that the examination process is as straightforward as possible.

If evidence and justification for the proposals are not clear within the application this can lead to delays and complications both during the pre-examination and examination periods, and under-prepared applications can lead to longer and more complex examinations, and potentially higher costs for applicants.

The Applicant enquired as to which draft documents are most helpful to be reviewed. The Inspectorate advised that, as a minimum, they usually review the draft Development Consent Order (DCO), the Explanatory Memorandum, the Statement of Reasons and Consultation Report. It is also helpful for the Applicant to complete its own s55 checklist and the Inspectorate can review this. The Applicant was advised that they should allow 2-3 months for the review stage.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to ensure that an explanation of the split between integral and associated development is given in the Explanatory Memorandum. There should be clear justification for the decisions made and this should be consistent throughout the application documents.

The Applicant advised that they will be seeking flexibility for some parts of the associated development in their draft DCO. This is partly due to some elements being outside of the Applicant's control, such as highways lighting. However, the Applicant explained that illustrative designs would be provided within the Design and Access Statement. The Inspectorate iterated the need to ensure that any flexibility is fully explained and justified. The Applicant explained that they are in discussions with the relevant statutory parties and the Inspectorate advised the Applicant to get draft Statements of Common Ground in place with those parties stating where there is agreement for the detail to be agreed at a later date. The Inspectorate stated that a Statement of Commonality for Statements of Common Ground may be useful.

The Applicant is also seeking flexibility in the amount of temporary accommodation required as it is not known whether all workers will need to be based on site or whether some will be within commuting distance. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to ensure that the traffic modelling takes this variation into account. The Inspectorate also advised that where development such as the temporary accommodation is proposed to be built in phases, the photomontages reflect this. The Applicant confirmed it intends to provide indicative phasing plans which will be identified as for illustrative purposes only.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to ensure that the IoACC was aware of its potential responsibilities in discharging requirements. The Applicant explained that they are in regular contact with the authority and will share an early draft of the DCO with them.

The Applicant stated that they would like to contact countries that have responded to the Transboundary screening. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to look at the contacts listed on the Espoo website. It would be helpful if any country with an interest in the application registered as an Interested Party at the appropriate time.

The Applicant and the Inspectorate discussed the requirements under the Welsh Language scheme regarding translation of documents and oral translation at hearings. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that where Welsh language versions of documents were submitted, these should generally be submitted at the same time as the English version to avoid confusion, and ensure that all participants had equal opportunity and timescales to review and comment on the documentation.

Specific decisions/ follow up required?

- The Inspectorate will send their list of venue requirements to the Applicant to assist with drawing up a list of suitable Preliminary Meeting and hearing venues [post meeting note: this has been provided].
- The Applicant to provide the Inspectorate with an initial list of what documents they consider they will need to translate