



Preliminary Meeting note

File reference	Internal Power Generation Enhancement for Port Talbot Steelworks EN010062
Status	Final
Author	Louise Evans
Date	09 December 2014
Venue	Blanco's Hotel, Green Park, Port Talbot SA12 6NT

Please note: This meeting note is not a full transcript of the Preliminary Meeting but a summary of key points discussed and responses given. A complete [audio recording](#) of the event is available on the Internal Power Generation Enhancement for Port Talbot Steelworks project page of the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website.

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. The Examining Authority's (ExA's) introduction to the principles of the examination and how the ExA proposes to conduct the examination**
- 3. Any submissions on matters not set out in the agenda, that were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by 2 December 2014**
- 4. Initial Assessment of Principal Issues**
- 5. Update from the Applicant and Interested Parties on the progress of procedural issues**
- 6. Draft Timetable for the examination**
- 7. Any other matters**
- 8. Close of meeting**

1. Welcome and introductions

Roger Eyre opened the Preliminary Meeting preceding the examination of the application for the Internal Power Generation Enhancement for Port Talbot Steelworks project by welcoming all attendees and introducing himself as the Examining Authority (ExA) appointed by the Secretary of State (for Energy and Climate Change).

The ExA introduced members of the case team for this project from the Planning Inspectorate, and confirmed the presence of a Welsh translator.

The ExA set out the procedures in place in case of an emergency, and requested all phones be switched to silent or turned off.

An announcement was made by the ExA that there were issues with the hotel's lift, and that if any attendees arrived who required the use of the lift for disability/mobility purposes, the hearing would have to be postponed.

The ExA welcomed all parties to the Preliminary Meeting and listed the circumstances which qualified them as attendees-

- As representatives of bodies who are Statutory Parties,
- As persons who have submitted a Relevant Representation and therefore qualified as Interested Parties for the project,
- As individuals or bodies affected by the application for compulsory acquisition of land or rights over land,
- As the Applicant or
- As a Local Authority

The ExA confirmed that this was meant to be a working meeting, in order to focus on how the ExA would examine the application, and that only procedural aspects were to be discussed. The ExA advised the attendees to remember that evidence would not be taken during this meeting, and the merits of the proposal would not be discussed.

The ExA confirmed that the merits of the application would only be discussed once the examination started, which would begin the day after the close of the Preliminary Meeting (Wednesday 10th December 2014).

The planned arrangements for breaks were announced.

The ExA announced that he wished to temper efficiency with fairness, and intended for all attendees to have their opportunity to speak, and to allow the best use of the time available, emphasising that all contributions should be to the point and be as focussed as possible, without repetition of any points already made.

The ExA stated that a note was being taken of the meeting, and would be published on the Port Talbot Steelworks project page of the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website, and made available to view online at the locations listed in Annex E of the Rule 6 letter. The ExA announced that the audio recording of the Preliminary Meeting would also be published on the Port Talbot Steelworks project page of the Planning Portal website shortly.

The ExA informed the meeting that there were both fixed and roving microphones available, and advised all attendees to give their names and the organisation which they represented, speaking clearly into the microphones in order to give a clear audio recording of the meeting, as well as to ensure that all attendees present could hear.

The ExA asked if there were any journalists present, or any persons who intended to record, tweet or film the proceedings for their own use. There were no responses.

The ExA then asked for any Affected Persons (being any people, firms or bodies who are affected by the application to compulsorily acquire land or rights – or representatives of affected persons) present to introduce themselves. There were no responses. The ExA confirmed that there were no Affected Persons present at the Preliminary Meeting.

The ExA then announced the introduction of the parties present, beginning in no order of precedence, with the Applicant.

Duncan O'Connor confirmed that he was a solicitor from Pinsent Masons representing the applicant Tata Steel. Also representing the Applicant was:

- Ben Lewis from GVA, the planning advisors to the Applicant
- Guy Simms, the Project Manager from Tata Steel UK Limited and
- Catherine Anderson from AECOM, the environmental consultants for the project.

The ExA then asked for any representatives from local authorities to introduce themselves.

From Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council:

- Paul Colman, Senior Planning Officer;
- Chris Davis, Team Leader, and;
- David Adlam, Highways Development Control Manager

From City and County of Swansea:

- Richard Jones, Town Planner

The ExA then asked for any representatives of governmental bodies, including community councils, to introduce themselves.

From Natural Resources Wales (NRW):

- Louise Edwards, Senior Development Planning Advisor

The ExA then asked for any representatives of statutory undertakers to introduce themselves.

For Associated British Ports:

- Brian Greenwood, partner and solicitor of Osborne Clark, representing Associated British Ports
- Byron Lewis, Estate Surveyor of Associated British Ports

The ExA then asked for introductions from any representatives of local and national amenity bodies, expert and representative bodies, any members of the local community who had not already introduced themselves, and anybody else in the room not already mentioned by the ExA who wished to speak. There were no responses.

The ExA reminded all statutory bodies and local authorities present that unless they had already submitted a relevant representation, they would need to a request in writing to become an Interested Party, in order to be kept up to date and to take part in the examination

2. The Examining Authority's (ExA's) introduction to the principles of the examination and how the ExA proposes to conduct the examination

The ExA acknowledged that some attendees present were familiar with the process of examining applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructures (NSIPs) under the 2008 Planning Act, and also that some attendees would be unfamiliar with this process.

The ExA stated that, in accordance with s.87, sub-section (1) of the 2008 Planning Act, it is for the Examining authority to decide how to examine the application.

The ExA then outlined the six attributes of the examination system under the 2008 Planning Act, describing how they would be implemented for the examination of this project:

1. Independence and Impartiality-

The ExA confirmed that he is employed by the Planning Inspectorate, which is a joint Executive Agency of the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Welsh Government (DCLG). For the examination of nationally significant infrastructure projects the ExA produces an independent and impartial report with a recommendation to the relevant Secretary of State (the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change). It is the Secretary of State who will then make the decision on the application. In making this decision, the Secretary of State is required by statute to decide an application in accordance with any relevant National Policy Statement, but only if it is lawful to do so and is in accord with our international obligations and if the adverse impacts of the proposed development do not outweigh its benefits.

2. Rigour;

The ExA explained that the system for examining applications for NSIPs under the 2008 Planning Act relies primarily on written evidence, which consists of:

- Written representations from Interested Parties;
- The ExA's questions;
- Responses to the ExA's questions; and
- Comments on the responses of other parties from Interested Parties

The ExA confirmed that he will also request specific reports, including Local Impact Reports (LIRs) prepared by Local Authorities and matrices from the applicant, which will enable the ExA and the Planning Inspectorate to produce a Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES).

The ExA stated that this written evidence is supported, where required, by different types of hearing:

- Open Floor Hearings, in which all interested parties have the opportunity to speak, and is held if requested by any Interested Party, or if deemed necessary by the ExA. In this case, the ExA has decided to include an Open Floor Hearing in the examination timetable for this project.
- Issue Specific Hearings, which deal with some or all of the key issues relevant to the examination of the application. These hearings may include one or more on the nature of the scheme itself, focussing on the draft Development Consent Order. It was also confirmed that if the ExA decided not to hold a hearing on a particular issue, it would not mean that this issue would not be fully considered in preparing the report and recommendations to the Secretary of State.
- Compulsory Acquisition Hearing – this is held if requested by any affected party. In this case, the ExA has decided to include a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing as part of the examination timetable.

3. A focus on evidence and justification;

The ExA issued a warning that unsubstantiated assertions would not be accepted by any party, and reiterated the importance of providing evidence which supported any evaluation or assertions.

It was also pointed out by the ExA that the 2008 Planning Act allowed them to disregard any representation regarded by them as vexatious, frivolous, related to the merits of policy set out in a national policy statement, or to compensation for compulsory acquisition of land or of an interest in or right over land.

4. Openness;

The ExA stated that all advice given since June 2013 from the Planning Inspectorate to the applicant and others had been published on the [Port Talbot Steelworks project page of the Planning Inspectorate website](#), including notes of meetings and telephone conversations, and that this commitment to openness would continue from the start of the examination onwards.

The ExA confirmed that the proper running of the examination would require that all evidence provided; all responses to this evidence, all of the ExA's questions and all other materials provided would be published on this website during the examination.

5. Fairness;

The ExA stated that the procedure for the examination of NSIPs is designed to give all interested and affected parties the equal right to put forward their views, and to provide equal access to all information related to the application. It was also stated by the ExA that cross examination during hearings occurs as an exception, and that ExAs are also called Inspectors as they adopt an inquisitorial approach in their written questions as well as when asking questions during hearings. The ExA confirmed that it was his intention to not intimidate anyone taking part in the examination following this Preliminary Meeting.

6. Timeliness

The ExA confirmed that under legislation he is required to complete this examination within 6 months, beginning with the day after the start of the examination, and that effectiveness would depend on all parties meeting the deadlines set out in the examination timetable.

The ExA then outlined the two conditions of costs, as included in the Rule 6 letter, from the revised guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in July 2013:

1. Where the party against whom the award is sought has acted unreasonably; and the unreasonable behaviour has caused the party applying for the award of costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense during the examination.
2. Where separate provisions apply to the award of costs in relation to an application for compulsory acquisition

The ExA then asked if there were any questions from the attendees on how he intended to examine the application. There were no responses.

3. Any submissions on matters not set out in the agenda, which were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by 2 December 2014

The ExA stated that Annex A of the Rule 6 letter invited submissions on any matters that were not set out in the agenda to be received by the Planning Inspectorate by 2nd December 2014, and by this date no further submissions were received.

The Applicant stated that they wished to draw the ExA's attention to a letter that was sent by them on Monday 8th December 2014 to the Planning Inspectorate, and that although they appreciated that the ExA may not have had time to read the letter, they felt that this was the appropriate point of the agenda to raise it.

The Applicant explained that the letter sets out a revision to the parameters of two of the elements of the proposed development, which the Applicant considers to be necessary, and that this was an issue that had only come to light recently. The Applicant stated that the purpose of the letter was to bring the matter to the ExA's attention, so that any procedural decisions that the ExA would have to make at or

after the Preliminary Meeting could take this information into account, and that they were happy to provide any further information at this present time.

The ExA confirmed their awareness of this letter, which was received by the case team yesterday whilst they were travelling to the Preliminary Meeting and that for reasons relating to internal security they were unable to access the letter in its full form. The ExA stated that the letter would await the team's return to the Planning Inspectorate office where they would record the information and respond accordingly.

4. Initial Assessment of Preliminary Issues

The ExA stated that their initial assessment of the principal issues was set out in Annex C of the Rule 6 letter, and asked if there were any comments from the attendees present relating to these. There were no responses.

5. Update from the Applicant and Interested Parties on the progress of procedural issues

The ExA stated that they had made 5 procedural decisions which were included in Annexe G of the Rule 6 Letter about how the application is to be examined under section 89 sub-section (3), which include:

- the progression of an Environmental Permit;
- Production of Habitats Regulations (HRA) 2010; Screening Matrices;
- Agreement of Protective Provisions;
- Production of Statements of Common Ground; and
- Preparation of Local Impact Reports

The ExA stated that they had also made the procedural decision to

- accept a late representation from Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council, which was available on the Planning Inspectorate's website, and;
- accept the Applicant's Errata document which was received on 12th August 2014 and which addresses issues relating to their Consultation Report .

The ExA confirmed that the latter document would subsequently be made available to view on the project pages of the Port Talbot Power Station project page of the Planning Inspectorate's website, and would also be available to view electronically at the deposit locations listed in Annex E.

The ExA stated that they had requested an update from the applicant and other Interested Parties on the progress made so far on the procedural issues associated with the application as well as on resolving the procedural issues which had been raised in the Relevant Representations.

The ExA described how these updates would be dealt with in turn as set out within the agenda, and reminded the attendees as already mentioned in the introduction, that

evidence would not be taken, the merits of the application must not be discussed, and that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss procedural aspects only.

The ExA requested an update from the Applicant, and then the representative of NRW, on the progress of the preparation and submission of the application for a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010.

The Applicant confirmed that they have commenced discussions with NRW on the application for an environmental permit, and that this was not made in parallel with the Development Consent Order, which the applicant appreciated is encouraged by the National Policy Statements, but which is not a requirement.

The Applicant stated that a meeting has been arranged between themselves and NRW for early 2015, and would aim to enter into a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) with them, which would seek to find a form of words where NRW could give comfort that it sees no reason why the environmental permit would not be granted, whilst not prejudicing the outcome of the application already submitted for the environmental permit.

The Applicant confirmed that to date the discussions with NRW had been positive.

In response to this, NRW confirmed that they were in agreement with the Applicant.

The ExA then requested from the Applicant information on the work done in preparing the HRA Screening Matrices.

The Applicant stated that the HRA Screening Matrices were intended to be appendices to the No Significant Effects Reports (Document 5.03) submitted as part of the application, however due to administrative errors the appendix was missed, although it had been prepared. Since the No Significant Effects Report was submitted, NRW's relevant representation noted that it did not agree with conclusion of that report, i.e. that there were no significant effects, particularly in relation to the in combination effects with Crymlyn Bog.

In response to this, the Applicant continued to liaise with NRW, and as part of these discussions have now clarified and agreed the content of the screening matrix, and in addition have prepared a report to inform the appropriate assessments on the basis that no significant effects on Crymlyn Bog can not be ruled out, and therefore the competent authority would be required to carry out an assessment based on that particular effect.

The report to inform the appropriate assessment also contains a matrix in the form as set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note, and is called an Integrity Matrix, which sets out the potential effects on the integrity of the Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The content of this matrix has been agreed with NRW, and the applicant is now in a position to submit both documents to the Planning Inspectorate, which they intended to do as soon as possible.

In response, NRW confirmed that they were in agreement with Tata Steel, and were awaiting the formal submission of these documents before submitting their response.

The ExA then requested an update on the drawing up of protective provisions from the Applicant, following the order as stated in the agenda, beginning with NRW.

The Applicant stated that they intended to incorporate protective provisions into their order for the benefit of the following parties:

- Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
- National Grid Electricity Transmissions
- National Grid Gas
- Western Power Distribution
- Welsh Water

The Applicant stated that at this stage they were not intending to provide protective provisions for the benefit of NRW as they were not aware that NRW had requested this. The Applicant offered to provide an update on the progress of protective provisions with the organisations listed. The ExA agreed to this.

Network Rail – the Applicant confirmed that the form of words of the protective provision with Network Rail had been agreed, however one correction needed to be made to the numbering, which was included in the submission version of the DCO. The content remains correct, and the correction to the numbering will be included when the next iteration of the DCO is submitted.

National Grid – the Applicant has contacted both National Grid Electricity Transmissions and Gas, and is currently awaiting the standard version of National Grid’s protective provisions; which National Grid have indicated to the Applicant that they will send.

Western Power Distribution – have indicated to the Applicant that they do not have a standard version of protective provisions, as this should depend on the context of each Order, but are happy for the Applicant to submit to them the protective provisions which they consider as necessary to their Order. The Applicant will submit to Western Power Distribution within the next week.

Welsh Water – The Applicant is in active discussions with Welsh Water over the required protective provisions, particularly in relation to the Afan Valley Trunk Sewer which runs through the site. The terms of this have been agreed, and now need to be put into a form of provision to be incorporated into the Order.

The Applicant concluded that they hoped to be in a position to include these provisions within the DCO to be provided by Deadline 2.

The ExA asked the Applicant to confirm that they were not intending to draw up protective provisions with any other relevant parties. The Applicant confirmed this as correct.

The ExA asked if there were any bodies present at the meeting who felt that they should be engaged in discussions on protective provisions.

Associated British Ports stated that at this point they had not engaged in any discussions or negotiations with Tata Steel over protective provisions, but wanted to reserve the point that over the next few weeks conversation may be entered into

between themselves and the Applicant, and confirmed that they would inform the ExA of any appropriate information within their Written Representation.

The ExA requested an update on the preparation of Statements of Common Ground (SOCG), following the order set out in the agenda.

The Applicant stated that their SOCG with Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council (NPTCBC) is currently being developed, and hoped to submit this shortly after Deadline 1.

NPTCBC confirmed that they were in dialogue with GVA (the planning advisors to Tata Steel UK Limited), and expected to receive the SOCG shortly.

The Applicant stated that they had not submitted a SOCG to City and County of Swansea, but if the council considered it necessary, the Applicant would provide a SOCG to them within the same timescales as NPTCBC.

The City and County of Swansea confirmed that they had been in discussions with GVA over the timetabling of the SOCG, and that once the submissions for Deadline 1 had been received, they would be aware of their position over the local impacts, and would be in a position to prepare the SOCG with the Applicant.

The Applicant stated that Carmarthen Council have confirmed verbally that a SOCG between them is not required.

The Applicant stated that they had contacted Powys Council to discuss the possibility SOCG with them, and were awaiting their response.

The Applicant confirmed that they would be in contact with Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council to discuss the possibility of a SOCG with them.

The Applicant has contacted Bridgend Council to discuss the possibility of a SOCG, and is still awaiting their response.

Brecon Beacons National Park Authority has confirmed to the Applicant that they do not wish to enter into a SOCG.

A draft SOCG has been submitted to NRW, and the Applicant is waiting on their comments.

The Applicant confirmed that Welsh Water's concerns would be best addressed through protective provisions, including the Order. The Applicant would then confirm this position via a letter to the ExA, and a SOCG would not be required in addition to this.

The Applicant confirmed that they were in a similar position with National Grid Electricity Transmissions and National Grid Gas, that they felt that protective provisions were a more appropriate method of dealing with their concerns than a SOCG.

The Applicant is in discussions with the Coal Authority and is currently carrying out ground and site investigation works. The Applicant has agreed to submit the results to

the Coal Authority in early 2015, and once these are received, both parties can take a view on the SOCG as a potential next step.

Network Rail responded to the Applicant yesterday confirming that a SOCG would be appropriate, and the Applicant will be sending a draft to them shortly.

In addition to the parties listed in the agenda, the Applicant also contacted Gwent and Glamorgan Archaeological Trust as they were involved in pre-application discussions, and they have confirmed that a SOCG from them is not required.

The Applicant will be seeking to contact Royal Mail and Welsh Government Highways to establish whether or not a SOCG is required.

It is the Applicant's understanding that work is on-going with Associated British Ports, and modelling is currently being undertaken to model the potential scenario of dry conditions, which was raised in ABP's relevant representation. The Applicant is hopeful that once the results are agreed, or not agreed, the SOCG can be prepared, setting out the points of agreement and disagreement.

The Applicant stated that they hoped that Western Power Distribution's concerns could also be dealt with via protective provisions, and that a SOCG with them would not be required.

The ExA asked if any parties present wished to add to the Applicant's comments on SOCG. There were no responses.

The ExA asked the Applicant to ensure that once the responses were received, that the SOCG records that there are no issues outstanding between them and the relevant organisation, not just that a SOCG is not required. The Applicant confirmed their understanding of this.

The ExA asked if there were any bodies represented who felt that they should be engaged in discussions of SOCG. There were no responses.

The ExA asked for representatives of the local authorities present to give an update on the progress of their Local Impact Reports (LIRs).

NPTCBC confirmed that their LIR was currently being compiled, and hoped to submit this to the planning committee by 13th January 2015.

The representative of City and County of Swansea confirmed that they had been given delegated powers by the committee last week to make a submission in accordance with Deadline 1 of the examination timetable.

6. Draft Timetable for the examination

Prior to discussing the draft examination timetable, the ExA pointed out that in light of the general election planned for May 2015, the examination would continue throughout the pre-election period, from 30th March to the election day on 7th May 2015. The ExA asked that during this time all relevant local and national government agencies should ensure that any decision making and/or approval procedures required

by the examination of this application can still be undertaken effectively so that the deadlines in the examination timetable could be maintained.

The ExA asked if there were any comments on the deadlines set out in the examination timetable.

The Applicant stated that they would like to propose a minor change to the proposed timetable, for two reasons. The first was that the ExA's First Written Questions were due to be issued after the Preliminary Meeting, and if these were received close to the Christmas holidays it was likely that most consultants would be absent. The Applicant therefore requested to 'push back' Deadline 1 by one week, changing it from 15 January 2015 to 22 January 2015. This would have consequential effects for subsequent deadlines.

The Applicant stated that their second reason for requesting to change the dates of the draft examination timetable was related to the letter issued by them to the ExA yesterday (Monday 8 December 2014). The Applicant considered that the best way to deal with that letter would be for the additional information relating to the revisions to be provided to the Interested Parties and also publicised in the local area, which the Applicant would be able to carry out next week.

The Applicant proposed that anyone wishing to comment on this would be required to provide their views to the ExA by Deadline 1 as proposed by them (22 January 2015), which would allow for more than the 28 day minimum consultation period which is generally provided during pre-application consultation.

The Applicant stated that with these two issues in mind, they proposed the following changes to the examination timetable, in addition to the change to Deadline 1 as already mentioned:

- The proposed date for Deadline 2: to be amended from Thursday 5 February to Thursday 12 February 2015
- The proposed date for the Issue Specific Hearing on the draft DCO: to be amended from Thursday 12 February to Thursday 19 February 2015
- The proposed date for Deadline 3: to be amended from Tuesday 17 February to Tuesday 24 February 2015
- The proposed date for the Accompanied Site Visit: to be held Wednesday 25 February 2015
- The proposed date for the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing: to be held Thursday 26 February 2015
- The proposed date reserved for the continuation of the Hearing on Environmental matters: Friday 27 February 2015
- The proposed date for Deadline 4: to be amended from Thursday 5 March to Friday 13 March 2015

- The proposed date for Deadline 5: to be amended from Thursday 19 March to Friday 27 March 2015
- The proposed date for the issue of the ExA's Report on Implications on European Sites (RIES) and Second Written Questions: to be amended from Thursday 26 March to Friday 3 April 2015

The Applicant stated that any dates subsequent to these could remain the same and that their proposed changes would allow for the 'slack' around April and May of the current draft timetable to be retained.

The Applicant stated that NPTCBC had already been informed of these suggested changes in order to obtain their views and so that the information would not come as a surprise to them during the Preliminary Meeting.

The ExA asked for any comments from the attendees on the Applicant's proposed changes to the examination timetable. There were no responses.

The ExA stated in their response that these proposed changes would be listened to and taken on board, but that a decision would not be made today. The ExA confirmed that they would take these proposed changes into consideration when issuing the subsequent Rule 8 letter and the date for Deadline 1 would currently remain as Thursday 15 January 2015.

The ExA stated to the Applicant that the timing of their letter sent the day before was unfortunate, as particular effort had been made to convene the Preliminary Meeting before Christmas, and now, for reasons beyond the ExA's control, the Applicant were requesting to push the dates back. The ExA confirmed that nevertheless, they would consider the reasons given and respond accordingly.

The Applicant acknowledged this, and responded that they were grateful that the current date for Deadline 1 (15 January 2015) had been arranged for after the first week of January.

The ExA stated that the hearings as listed in the timetable of the Rule 6 letter and subject to the Rule 8 letter that would be issued subsequently to the Preliminary Meeting.

The ExA asked if notwithstanding the Applicant's comments, there were any parties present who had any issues with the timetable for hearings as set out in the Rule 6 letter. There were no responses.

The ExA asked if any parties wished to comment on the date reserved for the Accompanied Site Visit, as set out in the Rule 6 letter.

Associated British Ports asked if the ExA intended to visit the port as well as the power station site.

The ExA confirmed that they were willing to accept proposed itineraries in relation to the ASV, and would be drawing up their own itinerary once they had reviewed more information.

ABP suggested that they would speak to Tata and if it was subsequently decided that viewing the port would be appropriate then they would liaise with the Case Officers to discuss practical arrangements for the Accompanied Site Visit.

7. Any other matters

The ExA confirmed that they had not been notified of any other matters, apart from the letter that was raised in Item 3 of the agenda, and that this had been acknowledged and discussed.

The ExA asked if there were any other relevant items that anyone else present wished to raise. There was no response.

8. Close of meeting

The ExA thanked the attendees for contributing to the meeting, acknowledging that all had been helpful, and that he looked forward to the examination of the application.

The ExA reminded the attendees that the notes and audio recording of the meeting would be made available as soon as practicable on the Port Talbot Steelworks page of the National Infrastructure planning portal website. The ExA also confirmed that they would be issuing a letter following the PM setting out the final timetable and any procedural decisions made by them, as well as their first round of written questions.

The ExA stated that the Planning Inspectorate would also welcome comments from the attendees on the suitability of the venue for future hearings.

The ExA thanked everyone again for attending, and closed the meeting.