



## Meeting Note

<b>File reference</b>	<b>EN010054 – South Hook CHP Project</b>
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	<b>Karl-Jonas Johansson</b>

<b>Meeting with</b>	
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>30 October 2012</b>
<b>Attendees (Planning Inspectorate)</b>	<b>Tom Carpen (Principal Case Manager) Karl-Jonas Johansson (Assistant Case Officer) Frances Russell (Senior EIA Advisor) Hannah Pratt (EIA Advisor)</b>
<b>Attendees (non Planning Inspectorate)</b>	<b>Paul Ericsson (South Hook project SHE / Regulatory Manager) John Constable (South Hook project Communications Manager) Lyn Powell (South Hook project Senior Planning Director) Vicki Hirst (Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority) David Popplewell (Pembrokeshire County Council) Andrea Winterton (Countryside Council for Wales) Karen Maddocks-Jones (Countryside Council for Wales) Louise Edwards (Environment Agency Wales) Gareth Lewis (Environment Agency Wales) John Hogg (Environment Agency Wales)</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>South Hook Terminal, Milford Haven, Wales</b>

<b>Meeting purpose</b>	<b>Outreach meeting</b>
------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Summary of key points discussed and advice given</b>	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate (PINS), South Hook CHP project (the developer), the Countryside Council for Wales (CCW), Environment Agency Wales (EAW), Pembrokeshire County Council and Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority (PCNPA) introduced their team members and their roles to the meeting. PINS advised that a meeting note and a copy of the PINS presentation would be circulated amongst the attendees and published on our website in accordance with S.51 of the Planning Act as amended.</p> <p><b>Introduction to the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) process.</b></p> <p>PINS gave a presentation on the DCO process including the specific roles of the applicant, local authorities and statutory parties.</p>
---	--

### **Project timescales**

The developer gave a presentation about the progress of the project and advised that they plan to submit their DCO application in March 2013. PINS asked whether the developer was confident they had sufficient time to amend the DCO if any new issues came up during the second phase of the consultation which is timetabled for the first quarter of 2013. The developer advised that they would amend their timescales if necessary and notify PINS and the Statutory Parties if there were any changes to the timescale.

### **Visual Impact**

The applicant asked whether indicative drawings could be submitted with an application. PINS advised that it should be clear within application documents which illustrations are indicative, and if possible make agreements between parties about the design prior to submission. Visual impacts should be assessed on a worst case scenario. PCNPA raised concerns over their role in discharging requirements in relation to project design and potential visual impacts, should development consent be granted. They highlighted the need for local authorities to fully understand the background to any requirements and concerns that there may be a potential requirement for expert knowledge not held within the local authority. PINS advised PCNPA ensure they are content with the provisions in the draft DCO. PCNPA asked whether the DCO could be subject of conditions in a similar manner to an outline consent (ie) that required the detailed design to be in line with the illustrative submitted plans to ensure that the final design was as commented at DCO stage.

### **Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS)**

PCNPA requested clarification on what a DCO order could grant with respect to CCS, and what impact it would have on future applications made in the area especially in terms of cumulative impacts. They also queried whether the CCS should be taken into account in cumulative assessments for the proposed development. PINS advised PCNPA that it would look into this issue and follow it up with them. PINS also requested the other parties to look into this issue from their own perspective.

### **Rules of Engagement**

EAW informed the developer and the statutory parties that they will issue a document with agreed Rules of Engagements regarding what is expected of EAW, CCW and the developer during pre-application. The parties supported the approach and agreed to discuss this document further.

### **Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)**

The developer and CCW advised that they have met to discuss HRA, including relevant sites and features. PINS advised the developer that they expect the HRA matrices appended to PINS Advice Note Ten (Habitat Regulations Assessment relevant to

nationally significant infrastructure projects) to be completed and submitted with the application documents. PINS informed the developer that they provide the Secretary of State (SoS) with a Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) but do not provide a recommendation on the outcome of an Appropriate Assessment (AA), if required, since the SoS is the competent authority. PINS advised that there would be an opportunity for statutory nature conservation bodies and interested parties to comment on the RIES during the examination stage, should the application be accepted.

The developer advised that they intend to apply for an Environmental Permit (EP) in parallel with the DCO application. CCW requested clarification on how an Environmental Permit (EP) ties in with the DCO process, given that greater detail regarding technologies and emissions would be required for an EP than would be required for the assessment presented with the application in an Environmental Statement and for a report to inform an AA. PINS acknowledged this, and advised that the assessment during the Environmental Impact Assessment and for HRA purposes is undertaken on a worst case scenario, within which the design parameters of the EP would fit. PINS advised that an Examining Authority may request confirmation from the EAW that they see no reason why an EP would be refused, based on the information available.

#### **Grid Connection**

The developer informed the present parties that the grid connection to Pembroke Substation would be dealt with by a newly formed team and probably applied for under a separate consenting regime. The developer intends to minimise the need for overhead lines and anticipates that the majority of the grid connection would be underground.

#### **Draft Documents**

PINS advised the developer that they are able to review draft versions of the DCO, consultation report, Land and Works plans and HRA reports. If the developer wishes to submit draft application documents to PINS for comment, this should be done at least six weeks prior to submission. PINS would provide comments in a follow up meeting with the developer to be agreed in advance.

PINS advised the developer that the number of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) requested would be at the discretion of the Examining Authority, if the application is accepted for examination. The developer and interested parties should review the initial assessment of issues (Rule 8 letter) issued during the pre-examination stage to gain an indication of the SoCG(s) that may be requested.

#### **AOB**

	The developer confirmed to PINS that all necessary environmental surveys had been completed.
<b>Specific decisions/ follow up required?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rules of engagement to be agreed between Countryside Council Wales, The Environment Agency Wales, Pembrokeshire Coastal National Park Authority, Pembrokeshire County Council, and the Developer</li> <li>• PINS to advise the process by which the developer can comment on any responses to transboundary consultation, if undertaken</li> <li>• PINS to advise on how CCS will impact on the site</li> </ul>
<b>Circulation List</b>	All attendees