

Stakeholder Meeting Note

File reference	EN010024
Status	Final
Author	Tom Carpen

Meeting with	Eneco
Meeting date	24 June 2010
Attendees (IPC)	Laura Allen, Sheila Twidle, Lynne Franklin, Tom Carpen
Attendees (non IPC)	Andrew Prior, Helen Cassini, Sarah Holmes, Richard Guyatt
Location	IPC office Bristol

Meeting purpose	Project update and to discuss matters about the Environmental Impact Assessment process.
------------------------	---

Summary of outcomes	<p>Discussion topics:</p> <p>Eneco talked through presentation slides which included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to Eneco • Introduction to the project • Broad timetable, with application expected late 2012 • Current activities • Key issues so far – consents and consultation; human environment; landscape and visual; biological environment; grid issues; construction; ports/supply chain. <p>Pre-application timetable</p> <p>A period of informal consultation is planned for January 2011. An Environmental Impact Assessment scoping request is planned to be made to the IPC in February 2011, followed by formal consultation. An application is planned for late 2012.</p> <p>The level of work required by the process means that the applicant will need to identify issues with stakeholders early on and that the wording of any draft Development</p>
----------------------------	---

Consent Order will need to be a consideration throughout the pre-application process.

EIA scoping process

A question was asked on what the IPC would do if it did not receive a response from statutory consultees during the scoping consultation. Eneco has particular concerns about potential slow response times to its own consultation, particularly if there was an issue that needed resolving. IPC advised that there was a 42 day timescale to issue a scoping opinion, and that statutory consultees have 28 days to respond to requests. Only responses received within the deadline would inform any scoping opinion, although late responses would be forwarded to the applicant.

The IPC explained the scoping process and encouraged as much front loading of the process as possible. It advised that if there was sufficient information then it is possible to scope out issues. Additional helpful information included methodologies, significance levels and the physical scope of the area. The minimum requirements on what information must be provided are set out in the EIA Regulations.

The promoter can consult outside the IPC scoping consultation. The commissioners will decide the weight of any representations received from individuals who did not engage in pre-application consultation.

Habitats

Sufficient information should be provided by the applicant when the application is submitted to determine whether there are significant effects on a European or Ramsar site and if required to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. Before concluding the Appropriate Assessment the relevant nature conservation body will be consulted. If any applicant had a different view to the body consulted this could be raised with the IPC.

Consideration should be given by the applicant in drafting (DCO) requirements to the need for monitoring or mitigation of impacts on European or Ramsar sites affected.

Application flexibility

A question was raised about how much flexibility can be allowed in what is being applied for.

The project must be sufficiently described to enable an

	<p>environmental impact assessment to be undertaken. This should include an assessment of the worst case and in-combination and cumulative effects.</p> <p>The DCO should ensure sufficient flexibility as there is limited power to vary the DCO once an application is submitted.</p>
--	---

Specific decisions/follow up required?	None
---	------

Circulation List	All attendees
	Pete Bond (IPC Communications)