

Meeting note

Project reference	EN010039
Status	Final
Author	Adam Price
Date	23 April 2014
Meeting with	Palm Paper Limited
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Attendees	Developer Martin Page (DHA Planning) David Harvey (DHA Planning) Guido Jost (PCU Planning) Anton Dollinger (Palm Paper Limited)
	Planning Inspectorate Tom Carpen (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Adam Price (Assistant Case Officer) Laura Allen (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor)
Meeting Objectives	To provide the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) with an update on the proposed Palm Paper 3 CCGT Power Station project
Circulation	Meeting attendees

Summary of Key Points and Advice Given:

Introduction

The Inspectorate outlined its openness policy and ensured those present 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. Further to this, it was made clear that any advice given did not constitute legal advice upon which the applicant (or others) can rely.

Project Update

The developer explained that the project would consist of a 162MW CCGT power station to be located next to the existing paper mill. The power station would serve the purpose of providing electricity and steam to be used in the paper production process and would not be connected to the external national power grid.

An application for a new underground gas pipeline required for the proposed development would be sought in parallel to the power station Development

Consent Order (DCO), rather than be considered as Associated Development. Several routes for the gas pipeline are being considered through means of Feasibility studies.

The Inspectorate stated that it would be useful to be kept up to date with the consenting process for the separate gas pipeline, as the Examining Authority (ExA) may wish to examine this in terms of cumulative impact and likelihood of consent, should the application be accepted for examination.

Consultation

The applicant explained that they have engaged with statutory consultees since the formal Scoping Opinion was given by the Inspectorate.

It advised that s47 consultation had taken place between 25 January to 4 March 2013 with the main issue being coming out of this being impacts on air quality.

Further meetings were held with various statutory consultees post-consultation; with the main issue being raised was air quality. The Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Councils requested that the applicant make use of more recent data when conducting background air assessments.

Norfolk County Council would like to see a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and for this to be within the DCO as a requirement. The Inspectorate asked if the applicant intended to provide the council with a draft prior to submission of the application. The applicant expressed a desire to alternatively submit the document as part of the application.

The applicant explained that they intend to carry out a 28 day period of formal consultation under s42 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) ('the PA2008'). It is intended that a full application will be consulted upon at this stage.

Draft Documents

The Inspectorate recommended that the applicant set aside time to submit draft documentation to it for review, prior to the formal submission of the application. As part of this, it was requested that the applicant submit draft matrices alongside the applicant's Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) and suggested that Local Authorities, as the discharging authorities, are sent draft copies of the requirements for review.

The Inspectorate advised the applicant to make it clear in their application documents how any informal consultation carried out during the Pre-Application stage has been captured and had regard to.

The Inspectorate inquired as to the current status of the production of the applicant's HRA, in particular whether Natural England as the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body had agreed the scope of the assessment, the sites to be screened in and out of the assessment and the outcome of the applicant's HRA in relation to the European sites assessed. The applicant confirmed that these matters had been discussed and agreed with Natural England. The Inspectorate advised that this agreement should be clearly documented in the

applicant's HRA Report, including written confirmation from Natural England, i.e. a letter. The Inspectorate also advised the applicant to clearly document which 'other plans and projects' have been screened in and out of the applicant's 'In Combination' assessment and the conclusion of this assessment. . Again, this list of 'other plans and projects' should be discussed and agreed with bodies such as Natural England, prior to the submission of the DCO application for the proposed development.

The applicant stated that the Environment Agency (EA) had seen a full submission of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and raised no objections to this.

The applicant advised that an Environmental Permit (EP) would be required for the development and as such the applicant has held initial discussions with the EA regarding the possibility of submitting a variation to the existing permit. The Inspectorate suggested that the applicant discuss the production of this document with the Consents Service Unit (CSU) who can provide advice on any non-DCO consents the applicant may seek.

The applicant asked about various stages of the PA2008 process and the associated time scales. It was explained by the Inspectorate that ExA often request any Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) early in the Examination stage and as such it is recommended that discussions with statutory consultees are held as early as possible so these documents are close to completion by the end of the pre-examination stage, if the proposed development is accepted for examination.

The applicant anticipates submitting draft documents to the Inspectorate for review in June, with an application for development consent due to be formally submitted in August.

Future Meetings

Both parties agreed to discuss dates for a teleconference to discuss any updates to the project and hold a face to face meeting in July to discuss the draft documents submitted to the Inspectorate.