



Meeting note

Project name	Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station (Sizewell C)
File reference	EN010012
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	2 July 2019
Meeting with	NNB Nuclear Generation (SZC) Limited (The Applicant) and Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council (the Local Authorities)
Venue	Temple Quay House
Meeting objectives	Project and local area impact update
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Programme update

The Applicant provided an update on the programme going forward. It confirmed it intended to submit the Development Consent Order (DCO) application in quarter one (Q1) 2020.

The Applicant explained that prior to submitting the application it would be undertaking a fourth stage of statutory consultation, including Section 42, 47 and 48 consultation. It said this would be taking place for 10 weeks from 18 July 2019 to the 27 September 2019. The Inspectorate queried holding consultation over the summer holiday period, the Applicant explained that the consultation would be for 10 weeks, so it started and ended outside the holiday period.

Project update

The Applicant summarised responses to stage 3 consultation, noting responses from the public had been largely transport focused.

The Applicant explained that the upcoming stage 4 consultation would include all stage 3 documents but will also be an opportunity for consultation on updates to the project, including (but not limited to):

- A new freight management strategy with a more even mix between road and rail;
- Possible changes to the pylon on site, to reduce the height of some or all;
- Offsite sports facilities;
- Additional floodplain replacement land; and
- Additional ecological mitigation land for Fen Meadow and Marsh Harrier's habitat

The Applicant explained its recent scoping request to the Inspectorate mirrored the proposals as set out in stage 3, therefore its new freight management strategy was not included. The Inspectorate advised that options which were not included in the scoping report will not have been considered by the Inspectorate in making their scoping opinion. Therefore, the scoping opinion will not have taken this option into account and it sits outside of the scoping opinion that will be issued. The Applicant was advised to ensure that the Environmental Statement (ES) robustly assesses the development that is proposed.

The Applicant confirmed that an assessment of the chosen freight management option will be included in the ES and that the decision on which option to take forward would be made ahead of submission.

Local Authorities (LAs) update

The LAs explained their concerns regarding the number of proposed projects in their area and the lack of strategic coordination of these proposals. They spoke about how they supported Sizewell C in principal; noting a strong preference for a sustainable transport solution such as the rail-led approach.'. The LAs welcomed the stage 4 consultation as a further opportunity for consultation given that they considered a sustainable transport solution so important.

The LAs mentioned other proposed transport projects in the area. The Inspectorate advised that if applications are relying on these transport projects then the Examining Authority (ExA) is likely to want to know when they will be delivered and how they will be secured.

The Inspectorate and the LAs discussed Local Impact Reports (LIRs). The Inspectorate confirmed that they are a key document, noting that they are referenced in Section 105 (and 104) of the PA2008. The Inspectorate advised that the LIR was an opportunity for the LAs to bring their knowledge of the local area into the examination and to inform the ExA of matters that might not otherwise be part of the examination documentation. The Inspectorate suggested that such documents should be precise with the language used, as the ExA will only have six months to examine the application.

Inspectorate update on other projects

The Inspectorate noted that ScottishPower Renewables (SPR) will continue with their proposal to submit two separate and simultaneous applications for two offshore wind farms with the onshore aspects of these proposals within the LAs area of authority (East Anglia TWO (EA2) and East Anglia ONE North (EA1N)). As a result, the Inspectorate said it had given further thought to how any examinations of these applications (if they were both to be accepted for examination) could be held in a way which, where possible, reduces the resource implications on Interested Parties when dealing with two simultaneous examinations.

The Inspectorate reiterated that the following considerations are not a confirmed approach - a decision on the person or persons (and number of persons) constituting an ExA cannot be made until after an application has been accepted for examination. It is for any appointed ExA to determine how an examination will be held, and the Inspectorate said it was still looking into the potential implications of the following possible approach.

The Inspectorate highlighted that in this particular instance, where the same Applicant is proposing to submit two separate applications for each proposal, with identical application submission dates, and where certain parts of the order limits will be identical - the Inspectorate said it was considering the possibility of appointing the same persons to the two ExAs. For example, considering if the same (for example, five) persons could be appointed to examine both applications.

The Inspectorate said that in this scenario, it was considering the potential that the appointed ExAs may consider holding some hearings which consider both applications/draft DCOs (dDCOs) (regarding the aspects of the proposals where the order limits are identical, for example the onshore cable route corridor). It said it still considered that: two separate Preliminary Meetings (PMs) would be required; separate hearings for the examination of each application/dDCO are likely to be required, for

example where the order limits are not the same; and any Interested Party wishing to comment on both applications would need to submit any written submissions to both project email addresses separately (or send two separate hard copies by post). Persons wishing to become Interested Parties for each application would also be required to make a separate relevant representation for each application.

In light of the multiple projects in the area, the Inspectorate confirmed that each ExA will be appointed to examine the application to which they are appointed. For example, the ExA for Sizewell C will not research the examination submissions for EA2 or EA1N. Therefore, if a stakeholder considers that the ExA for Sizewell C should be aware of a particular matter on another case, they will need to bring this evidence into the Sizewell C examination and the ExA will consider its relevance. This could be done through the Local Impact Report in the case of the local authorities.

Cumulative Impact

The LAs asked how assessment of cumulative impacts between projects would be approached. The Inspectorate explained the requirements in relation to the ES and ensuring the cumulative effects are robustly assessed. Cumulative effects will be considered within each examination, based on the information available at the time. The Inspectorate referred to [Advice Note 17](#) for further information.

The Inspectorate informed the LAs that ExAs are likely to be interested in the opinions of the LA regarding the cumulative impact between projects. The Inspectorate, the Applicant and the LAs discussed how, along with the challenges that multiple developments in a small area present, there are also opportunities to bring about positive environmental improvements.

The LAs said that they remain concerned that, whilst it is reassuring that the Inspectorate is giving thought to how the work of the different hearings might be coordinated, there is still likely to be a lack of the coordination that is needed to ensure that the overall impact of all NSIPs on such a sensitive area is minimised. The LAs reported that they would be talking to Government officials to seek reassurance that measures will be taken to minimise the cumulative impact of all the projects when taken together. The LAs will also continue their dialogue with all the developers.

Examination procedure

The Inspectorate explained its trial of electronic only applications, mentioning that there will be an updated Advice Note on this published soon and offering to provide the Applicant with more information via e-mail.

The Inspectorate spoke about how some recent PMs have been followed by hearings and how requests for information (i.e. LIRs) have been made earlier in the process than previously.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Inspectorate to send an e-mail explaining the trial of electronic only application submissions to the Applicant
- The Inspectorate to identify any LIRs that they considered as helpful examples for the local authorities – in addition to those previously suggested