



## Meeting Note

<b>File reference</b>	<b>EN010025 - East Anglia ONE</b>
<b>Status</b>	<b>Draft</b>
<b>Author</b>	<b>John Pingstone</b>

<b>Meeting with</b>	<b>East Anglia One Ltd (EAOL)</b>
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>15 February 2013</b>
<b>Attendees (Planning Inspectorate)</b>	<b>Jessica Potter - Principal Case Manager Katherine Chapman - Case Manager John Pingstone – Assistant Case Officer Frances Russell – EIA Manager Laura Allen – Senior EIA Advisor</b>
<b>Attendees (non Planning Inspectorate)</b>	<b>Helen Thompson – EAOL James Donald – EAOL</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Temple Quay House</b>

<b>Meeting purpose</b>	<b>Update on East Anglia THREE and FOUR applications and logistical discussion on East Anglia ONE examination</b>
------------------------	---

<b>Summary of key points discussed and advice given</b>	<p>EAOL were advised about the Planning Inspectorate's openness policy (that any advice given will be recorded and placed on the planning portal website under s.51 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) (PA 2008) and that any advice given does not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) can rely.</p> <p><u>EAOL Team Structure</u></p> <p>EAOL began by explaining the structure of their team and organisation. East Anglia ONE Ltd is a 50/50 joint venture between Vattenfall and ScottishPower Renewables. The project manager for EA1 will be Helen Thompson and for EA3 and 4 the projects will be led by Keith Morrison.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> EAOL will send an Organisation chart</p> <p><u>Possible Submission Dates for East Anglia 3 and 4</u></p> <p>EAOL have previously thought that they would submit EA3 and 4 simultaneously; however given the resource demands of the examination process this is now being reconsidered. Submission dates for EA3 and 4 remain under review, but the latest indications suggest that EA3 may be submitted in Q42014 and EA4 6 months later.</p>
---	---

EAOL explained that EA3 and 4 would be using the same onshore cable route as EA1 and part of the same offshore route. Due to this the ducting for the cable has been designed to accommodate the additional cables that will arise from the future projects.

The Inspectorate queried whether a delay to EA3 and 4 would have any affect on the ducting issue. EAOL explained that the ducts would be in place for longer but that it did not affect their rationale.

#### Possible Change to Name of Project(s)

The naming of the series of projects was discussed, with regard to the potential for the current numbering to confuse members of the public and consultees. At present EA1 has been submitted to the Inspectorate and EA3 and 4 are expected to follow. It was explained that EA2 may be pushed back to 2015 or further due to issues that have arisen from bird surveys carried out on the site. It was thought that it could be potentially misleading for EA2 to be submitted after EA3 and 4.

EAOL queried whether it was possible to alter the name of a project and if so at what stage of the process that could be done. The Inspectorate explained that previous projects had had their name changed, but that the applicant should have regard to the possibility of confusion being caused to those people that have already been consulted using the previous name.

#### Statements of Common Ground – Preparing for Examination

EAOL explained that they are preparing their SoCG in the form of matrices. The Inspectorate agreed that the presentation of SoCG is at EAOL's discretion, so long as the information is clearly set out. It is of benefit to the Examining authority (ExA) if the information is concise.

It was also pointed out to EAOL that SoCG do not have to be finalised to be submitted, it can be helpful for the ExA to have an early version that shows areas of common and uncommon ground. SoCG's can also be split down into distinct areas rather than submitting one large SoCG.

The Inspectorate queried whether EAOL had had any difficulties engaging with any particular party. The Inspectorate informed EAOL that the some parties, such as the Ministry of Defence (MoD) had responded late in the process on other projects and, that as a result of this, a meeting is being planned between the Inspectorate and the MoD to help explain the PA2008 process and encourage engagement. In general terms it was explained that all efforts at engaging with parties should be documented so that the ExA are made aware.

### Cumulative and Zonal Issues

EAOL explained their approach to zonal appraisal. It was clarified that Kathy Wood of Vattenfall will be leading on high level cumulative impact concerns. She is liaising with Natural England and Joint Nature Conservation Council (JNCC).

In their capacity as an Offshore Transmission Owner (OFTO), EAOL are participating in ongoing work with National Grid to evaluate grid connection points and to ensure that the zone is connected in the most efficient manner.

Meetings have been held with developers of other Round 3 projects such as Dogger Bank and Hornsea, in order to assess cumulative impacts.

EAOL raised the issue of in combination effects with the proposed Galloper Offshore Wind Farm and the Alde-Ore SPA. The Galloper application is currently at the recommendation stage and it is likely that the decision will be made by the Secretary of State after the EA1 preliminary meeting but before potential hearings are held. It was thought by EAOL that the Galloper determination could have a large impact on the in combination impacts of the EA1 application. As a result, it was difficult to properly engage with Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs) such as Natural England. The Inspectorate pointed out that it was likely that the ExA would issue written questions under Rule 17 to explore the impacts of the Galloper application decision when it is made. It was also suggested by the Inspectorate that this issue should be clearly flagged to the ExA at the preliminary meeting.

### EA1 - Approach to the Examination

EAOL queried whether it is their responsibility to book venues. The Inspectorate responded that as it is the applicant's duty to pay for the venue it is logical that the applicant also book the venue. Having said this, the Inspectorate has programme officers that are able to assist with the organisation of venues and that it would be helpful if there could be cooperation on this matter.

Possible venues for the preliminary meeting were discussed, including IP-CITY, Ipswich Town Hall and Ipswich Football Club. EAOL said that they had used Ipswich Football Club previously and that they considered it a suitable venue, although all options will be explored.

**ACTION:** Inspectorate will send information to EAOL regarding possible hearings venues in the area and audio companies.

The possibility of an offshore site visit was discussed. The

Inspectorate explained that this had happened on previous projects, but that the need for such a visit was at the discretion of the ExA. EAOL suggested that if such a visit were to go ahead, the risks and health and safety implications should be carefully considered.

In addition an onshore site visit was discussed. If this is deemed necessary by the ExA it could be that access is required along the whole length of the onshore cable route. The Inspectorate suggested that preparatory work could be carried out to identify the most relevant viewpoints and access arrangements.

The need for risk assessments in regards to site visits and hearings was discussed. As EAOL has good knowledge of the area it was suggested by the Inspectorate that they could assist with compiling such assessments.

### Fees

EAOL enquired whether the Inspectorate's fees could be estimated at this stage. It was explained that all information in regard to fees is available in The Infrastructure Planning (Fees) Regulations 2010, but that at this stage we do not know whether the ExA will consist of a single Examining Inspector or a panel of 3 or more. It was explained that the letters requesting fees were not placed in the public domain and that applicants are given 28 days to make payment.

Methods of payment were discussed including the possibility of using a SAP system. EAOL suggested the possibility of paying the maximum fee upfront and then obtaining a refund in the event that the actual fee payable was less than the maximum.

**ACTION:** Inspectorate to make enquiries with their finance department and report back to EAOL.

### Future Communication and Document Submission

It was emphasised by the Inspectorate that it is important for EAOL to name documents clearly when submitting, in order to enable prompt publication and to avoid confusion. It was also pointed out that although general queries and contact can be made via the Case Manager, any submission of documents should be done via the project mailbox, in order that other members of the team can gain access.

EAOL queried whether it would be possible to maintain communication between themselves and the Inspectorate by regular meetings or telecons. The Inspectorate would be happy to hold meetings as and when EAOL feel that is would be beneficial, on the assumption that the meeting would be about process and procedure. It was suggested that it can be

	<p>worthwhile making contact on the day prior to significant events in the process.</p> <p><u>Habitats and Transboundary</u></p> <p>The Inspectorate pointed out that the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Report provided with the application appeared to relate to the advice given in our previous advice note and that a new advice note on this subject had now been published (Advice Note 10: Habitat Regulations Assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects, published January 2013). It was also suggested that EAOL have regard to the latest practice that has evolved on recent NSIP applications regarding HRA matrices, as it is likely that the ExA will request these during the examination process. It was suggested that EAOL may benefit from having sight of the Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) produced for related offshore windfarms.</p> <p>The Inspectorate discussed Transboundary consultation, which is currently underway and due to close on 8 March 2013. It was pointed out however, that responses may be received later in the process. As an example, a State had responded at the recommendation stage on another NSIP application and the representation had been sent to the Secretary of State for his consideration. Transboundary consultees are treated as any other consultee during the process.</p> <p><u>EA3 and 4 Update</u></p> <p>Scoping has been carried out for EA3 and 4. EAOL are currently considering the implications arising from the Inspectorate's scoping opinion.</p> <p>Relevant SNCBs have been invited to a meeting, which the Inspectorate is also attending, to discuss methodology in preparing the Environmental Statement. EAOL are also in discussion with MIEU (Major Infrastructure Environment Unit within DEFRA) with regard to the preparation of an evidence plan, which is a formal mechanism to agree upfront what information the applicant needs to supply to the Inspectorate as part of a Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p>
<p><b>Specific decisions/ follow up required?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Inspectorate will provide information to EAOL regarding fees and methods of payment</li> <li>- The Inspectorate to share information regarding hearing venues and organisation</li> <li>- EAOL to provide the Inspectorate with an Organisation/Team chart</li> </ul>
<p><b>Circulation List</b></p>	<p>All attendees</p>

