

**From:** Kathryn Dunne  
**Sent:** 01 June 2016 15:37  
**To:** Gideon Amos  
**Subject:** Moorside pre-application consultation

Dear Gideon

Following the submission of the s46 notification and s42, 47 and 48 consultation information, the Planning Inspectorate has noted the following:

### **Statement of Community Consultation**

- On a consistency note, the SoCC states that *'.....These railway works may also qualify as an NSIP, subject to their final design. Similarly, NuGen is proposing to carry out works for a Marine Off-Loading Facility (MOLF), which will comprise various elements to allow for ships and vessels to load and unload cargo, which may also, subject to final design, qualify as an NSIP'..... 'If the railway works or the MOLF are not ultimately definable as an NSIP, they may be included in the proposed DCO as Associated Development'*. The railway and MOLF works have also been grouped with associated development in other sections of the SoCC. However, other NuGen consultation documents state that the railway works are considered to be an NSIP but the MOLF is not. This could be confusing for consultees.
- Please can you confirm in writing, how (and which parts of) the rail aspects of the scheme qualify as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and the reasons why NuGen considers that the MOLF is no longer an NSIP.
- Page 7 of the SoCC refers to relevant national policy statements, however the National Networks NPS is not listed.
- Page 8 of the SoCC states: *'NuGen will aim to carry out a consultation on the scope of any proposed early site preparation works at the same time as the Stage Two Consultation starting in May 2016'*. Please can you confirm if consultation is being undertaken on early site preparation works?

### **S48 publicity notice**

- Has the notice been published in a national newspaper and the London Gazette (Regulation 4(3)(b) and (c) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure Regulations) 2009 as amended)?

### **Preliminary Environmental Information Report**

- Technical folder 1, section 1.2 'Planning Policy and Legislative Context' only refers to the Department for Energy and Climate Change as the decision maker and no reference to the Department for Transport is made.
- In paragraph 1.2.29 it states *'the Moorside project is likely to include.... Railway'*. It does not refer to the railway works as an NSIP. However in the PEIR non-technical summary paragraph 1.1.4 it states that the railway is an NSIP.
- In regard to cumulative effects, the PEIR states that the information on the North West Coast Connection Project was taken from National Grid's

website and section 3.4 of Technical Folder 1 states .... *'at this stage there are no planning or environmental documents regarding the preferred route option in the public domain'*. However National Grid submitted a scoping request to the Planning Inspectorate in September 2015 and the Planning Inspectorate issued the scoping opinion in October 2015 for this proposal.

### **General points**

We have been made aware that some consultees had only initially received some (and not all) of the application documents and others had technical problems accessing the USB. Are you able to confirm that all relevant consultees have now received a full copy of the consultation documents please?

Some consultees have expressed their concern at the level of detail which is made available (for example the lack of transport modelling information).

We have also been informed that consultees (members of the public and possibly others) did not receive the level of detail on the MOLF that was later provided at the consultation events. We are aware that NuGen responded to explain that the MOLF detailed information had only been produced following the start of the consultation. Are you able to confirm if this is the case and how NuGen will ensure that all relevant consultation information will be provided to all consultees (irrespective of whether or not they attended the events)? Are there any aspects of the MOLF (or any other aspects of the proposal) which are missing from this consultation which may require NuGen to undertake further consultation at a later date?

We have been made aware that NuGen has communicated to some consultees that it does not expect the proposals to change between now and submission, please can NuGen note that it must have regard to consultation responses received.

If further information arises on the potential impacts of the scheme on members of the public at a late date (for example through the Health Impact Assessment), will the local community have the opportunity to comment on this?

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards

Kath

Kathryn Dunne  
Infrastructure Planning Lead  
Major Applications and Plans Directorate

The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN  
Direct Line: 0303 444 5065  
Helpline: 0303 444 5000  
Email: [kathryn.dunne@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:kathryn.dunne@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Web: [infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk) (National Infrastructure Planning)

Web: [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate) (The Planning Inspectorate)

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Information Charter](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.