



Meeting Note

File reference	EN010038
Status	Final
Author	Emma Fitzpatrick

Meeting with	C.GEN
Meeting date	8 March 2013
Attendees (Planning Inspectorate)	Oliver Blower (Case Manager) Susannah Guest (Principal Case Manager) Lynne Franklin (Legal) Will Spencer (EIA Advisor) Emma Fitzpatrick (Assistant Case Officer)
Attendees (non Planning Inspectorate)	Florent Maes (C.GEN) Iris Dhollander (C.GEN) Ian Devine (C.GEN) Howard Bassford (DLA) Ben Dove-Seymour (DLA)
Location	Temple Quay House, Bristol

Meeting purpose	Project Update and Discussion on Draft Documents
----------------------------	---

Summary of key points discussed and advice given	<p>Introduction</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate outlined its openness policy and ensured that the applicant understood that any issues discussed and advice given would be recorded and placed on the Planning Inspectorate's website under s.51 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008). Further to this, it was made clear that any advice given did not constitute legal advice upon which the applicant (or others) can rely.</p> <p>Project Status Update</p> <p>The applicant (C.GEN) anticipates submitting their DCO application on 20 March 2013.</p> <p>The applicant confirmed that they are currently finalising the Environmental Statement, and that relevant sections had been issued to environmental bodies for review between January and February 2013 and followed up with subsequent meetings.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate noted the time lapse since the IPC Scoping Opinion was issued and queried whether the applicant had considered the need to request another Scoping Opinion to account for changes to the proposed development. C.GEN confirmed that throughout the pre-application stage they had been in regular contact with</p>
---	---

statutory bodies such as the Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage and the Marine Management Organisation. Accordingly the applicant stated that they were satisfied that another Scoping Opinion was not needed.

C.GEN confirmed that they believed that their consultation had been robust. C.GEN confirmed that their consultation included exhibitions and public events which welcomed public input. However, C.GEN confirmed that there had not been a large amount of interest in the scheme from the general public. The applicant attributed this to the uncontroversial nature of the project given that the site is located an already industrialised area.

The Planning Inspectorate questioned whether C.GEN had consulted National Grid, being a statutory undertaker, in relation to the fact that C.GEN proposes to move two existing National Grid compounds. C.GEN confirmed that the appropriate section 42 letters were sent.

The Planning Inspectorate advised the applicant to ensure they had consulted all the prescribed consultees specified in The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009. The Planning Inspectorate also encouraged the applicant to seek letters of comfort where possible and develop statements of common ground early on with local authorities and statutory bodies.

The applicant summarised other consents which they will seek in due course, including consents for emissions, grid/gas connections and potential commercial agreements.

The applicant confirmed that works within the Humber SPA are proposed. The Planning Inspectorate drew attention to the advice within Advice Note 10, including the need for the appended matrices to be completed and submitted for all relevant European Sites.

Draft Documents

Draft DCO

C.GEN confirmed that they aim to allow for flexibility in their development consent order (DCO), with the aim of delivering a power station capable of being operated as a CCGT or an ICGG plant. However, the applicant clarified that although there will be a degree of flexibility in the DCO, all options will be properly assessed and covered within the environmental statement.

C.GEN confirmed that 5 development scenarios were discussed with members of the public, and that the largest concerns regarded visual impact, coal dust and transport.

The Planning Inspectorate advised the applicant to consider whether decommissioning should also be provided for within the DCO.

The Planning Inspectorate confirmed that it would welcome a tracked changed version of the DCO submitted along with the final DCO and application, and should the project be accepted, subsequent track changed DCOs may be required throughout the examination for clarity.

The Planning Inspectorate noted general matters relating to inclusion of Crown Land within the Order limits and the provisions of s135 (1) preventing compulsory acquisition of an interest in Crown land except held otherwise by/on behalf of the Crown (necessitating Crown interests being "excepted") and the possibility of s138 being engaged. It should also be made clear whether statutory undertakers (if identified in a non prescribed schedule to the book of reference) held an interest in land in part 1 and/or 3).

Draft Plans

The applicant confirmed that the route corridor had been refined and that this had been consulted on. The applicant confirmed that the consultation report and submitted plans will clarify this position and the reasoning behind it.

Consultees List

A consultees list was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and accompanied the copies of the draft DCO.

Next Steps

The Planning Inspectorate outlined the final steps before submission:

- The applicant was asked to provide the GIS shape file of the final red line boundary to the Inspectorate as soon as possible before submission.
- The applicant was referred to Advice Note 6 and the need to submit the application with the electronic index.
- The applicant was reminded that the fees need to clear before the acceptance period commences.
- It was agreed to update the estimated submission date on the Planning Inspectorate website to 'March 2013'.
- Advised the applicant that throughout the acceptance period the Examining Authority could request all the correspondence received by the applicant and that the applicant should be prepared for this.
- The applicant was informed of updated CLG guidance.

	<p>AOB</p> <p>The applicant enquired as to whether there had been shorter acceptance periods than the statutory 28 days.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate advised that there is no 'rule of thumb' and that although it is a matter of record that some applications have been accepted in less than 28 days, the default position should be to prepare for the acceptance to take the full 28 days.</p> <p>The Applicant raised the question how long it would take between acceptance to the preliminary meeting. The Planning Inspectorate replied that this was partly dependant on the applicant but indicated a typical period of 2-3 months.</p>
--	--

Specific decisions/ follow up required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant to submit GIS shape file to the Planning Inspectorate.
--	--

Circulation List	All Attendees