



Meeting Note

File reference	EN010025 – East Anglia Offshore Windfarm (Zone 5) – East Anglia ONE
Status	Final
Author	Jolyon Wootton

Meeting with	East Anglia One Ltd. (EAOW), Bond Pearce, Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council
Meeting date	3 October 2012
Attendees (Planning Inspectorate)	Mike Harris (Case Leader) Tim Hallam (Legal Manager) Jolyon Wootton (Case Officer) John Pingstone (Assistant Case Officer)
Attendees (non Planning Inspectorate)	Helen Thompson (EAOW) James Donald (EAOW) John Houghton (Bond Pearce) Victoria Redman (Bond Pearce) John Pitchford (Suffolk County Council) Bob Chamberlain (Suffolk Coastal District Council)
Location	The Planning Inspectorate Offices, Temple Quay House, Bristol

Meeting purpose	Tripartite meeting between the Planning Inspectorate, Suffolk County Council, Suffolk Coastal District Council and the applicant EAOW and their legal representatives Bond Pearce, to discuss any issues before the submission of the application for 'acceptance'.
------------------------	---

Summary of key points discussed and advice given	<p>EAOW, Bond Pearce as well as Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council, 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>Following introductions, Suffolk County Council commented that the Council is supportive in principle to renewable energy projects and any associated benefits to the region. For the East Anglia ONE application, however, Suffolk County Council raised 6 areas of concern. The Local Authorities present said that Mid-Suffolk and Babergh Councils, although unable to attend</p>
---	---

this meeting, were also broadly supportive of the application in principle but had similar areas of concern to these.

Converter Station located at Bramford

As a point of record, Suffolk County Council stated they had only seen photomontages of the proposed converter station at Bramford and requested Ordnance Survey maps detailing the location and scale of the converter station (subject to the Rochdale Envelope).

EAOW said layouts plans and drawings of the proposed converter station would be available within the week and they are willing to discuss these with the relevant Local Authorities. Bond Pearce added the draft work plans set-out the location of the converter station and associated landscaping, whilst illustrative plans, in the Environmental Statement, and a design & access statement will address layout options and design principles.

s106 agreements on landscaping

The Local Authorities present said that they thought it would be necessary for the applicant to fund off-site landscaping in order to mitigate visual impacts of the proposed onshore development. The Councils said that to date, the applicant's 'landscape strategy' had only taken account of private views within the 'redline' boundary, not impacts on key public views.

Both Councils present suggested that a draft s.106 'heads of terms' and s.106 template based on those used for the Galloper Wind farm application could be used in this case.

The Planning Inspectorate recommended that Statements of Common Ground should if possible be agreed before the Preliminary Meeting (estimated to be mid-March 2013) to best serve the examination process. EAOW reported that s.106 heads of terms had been mooted via email, but formal discussions on s.106(s) have yet to take place.

Suffolk Coastal District Council expressed a preference to resolve heads of terms at the earliest opportunity. Answering Bond Pearce, the Councils said that the proposed s.106 in relation to Galloper empowers the Local Authority to receive contributions in order to, for example, grant aid to private land owners such as

farmers to carry out hedgerow improvements and realignments. Such funding could, for example, be as a result of a claim from an affected farmer or because the Council considered that works were necessary to address impacts on key view points.

Archaeological desk-based assessment

The Suffolk County Archaeologist has to date raised concerns with certain aspects of the written scheme of investigation and the desk-based assessment undertaken by EAOW. The Councils called for an agreement on methodology. The issue was detailed in a letter to the applicant of 17 September 2012 from the Suffolk County Council Archaeologist.

EAOW noted the issue as raised by Suffolk County on 7 September. Bond Pearce explained the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) addresses how archaeology is to be dealt with under draft requirement 26 in accordance with a written scheme of investigation. This was considered by them to be more rigorous than the model provisions wording. The Councils present said that they were happy with the wording of draft requirement 26.

Suffolk Coastal District Council said that any flaws in the desk-based assessment could potentially result in the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) being inadequate. They would wish to attend any meeting on this issue to determine whether to endorse the position of Suffolk County Council.

EAOW advised that they felt the EIA and the resulting ES was robust but they would be happy to discuss further with the county archaeologist.

The Planning Inspectorate advised failure to agree on the methodology would not necessarily delay the examination, but removing the issue before the examination commenced would be beneficial to the process. The Planning Inspectorate also advised that any divergence from the model provisions should be explained in the Explanatory Memorandum.

EAOW commented they would respond to both Councils following this meeting, but it was possible this issue was an area of uncommon ground that would need to be resolved during the examination process.

Suffolk Coastal District Council expressed unease with Suffolk County Council retaining enforcement powers over DCO requirements for any development within the area of Suffolk Coastal Council, and would state this in their representations. The Planning Inspectorate commented that enforcement powers reside with the Local Planning Authority where development lies.

Transport routes

Suffolk County Council commented that a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) could address their concerns with the proposed haul routes, but to date the Council had not received details of the applicant's proposed works or a draft Code.

EAOW said their outline CoCP was drafted, and they are willing to discuss requirements on routes and temporary closure of access. They were already providing details to local authorities and the highways agency on their preferred haul routes.

Suffolk County Council asked for consideration to be given to traffic passing and temporary road modifications. They expressed a preference for such impacts relating to the haul routes to be dealt with in a s.278 agreement. Suffolk Coastal District Council acknowledged that most of the proposed road works are within the highway network, but had concerns about site access and temporary routes. EAOW agreed that these issues would likely inform draft DCO requirements.

As a point of record, Suffolk County Council asserted that certain Parish Councils had not received published documentation on the proposed haul routes, as these hadn't been made available during Stage 2 Consultation. EAOW said this information was available on their project website and in Public Exhibitions.

Suffolk County Council were unlikely to comment on this within their adequacy of consultation response, but asked EAOW to assess predicted traffic volumes caused during the construction of the development on all proposed traffic routes. They also requested non-technical summaries to help the public understand the scheme.

The Planning Inspectorate recommended that the applicant should ensure application material is made

available where practicable and that this is comprehensible to local people, for example by providing non-technical summaries of some documents.

Socio-economic assessments

Analysis of socio-economic issues was not available from the applicant, since the Councils had not seen or been consulted on the relevant chapters from the draft Environmental Statement (ES), although Suffolk County Council welcomed any assessment of benefits to and other impacts on the region. In particular, they asked for in-combination studies on the offshore works and cumulative impacts with other energy projects, as well as: how ports in Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex could be best utilised; how foundation works and the transportation of construction material could be sub-contracted locally; and what training and skills could be developed locally. Suffolk County Council asked if these issues would be linked to the DCO. Although no ports are within the 'redline' boundary, Suffolk County Council welcomed an assessment of impacts on local port facilities in the ES. The County Council argued that certain ports in the area may not be equipped to accommodate large volumes of traffic or people.

EAOW confirmed that high-level principles are agreed, but late stage project details were not yet concluded. Any regional considerations for East Anglia ONE would be balanced against long-term commercial interests and national concerns. An assessment would form part of the ES.

Bond Pearce referred to permitted development rights available to the operators of ports, which would largely address any need for port related development in this area. The DCO would therefore not need to have schedules or articles on ports. EAOW have no plans to develop ports in the application. The ES would address any relevant impacts within the traffic and transport sections of the ES.

Cable route corridor at work 36

Suffolk County Council further requested the rerouting of the cable corridor around work 36 on the draft work plan so as to move it away from a proposed development of greenhouses using heat from the Sita UK Energy from Waste facility at Great Blakenham. The Energy from Waste facility already has planning permission and is being constructed. A planning

	<p>application for the greenhouse project, which is not being promoted by the County Council, is to be submitted shortly.</p> <p>EAOW said the cable corridor has been widened to accommodate this proposed project, and that they were prepared to continue to engage with Sita.</p> <p>EAOW said that they have requested specific details for this proposal which have been difficult to obtain due to the early stage of the Sita greenhouse proposal and that rerouting the corridor would be technically unfeasible since in this location it is the only suitable crossing point of the A14, Railway and River Gipping. Suffolk County Council hoped that planning permission would be received for the proposal by February 2013. The Planning Inspectorate advised the County to provide comments in their relevant representation.</p>
--	--

Specific decisions/ follow up required?	East Anglia ONE application expected to be submitted by EAOW for 'acceptance' on 14 November 2012.
--	--

Circulation List	Attendees
-------------------------	-----------