



## Meeting note

### File reference

**Status**

**Draft**

**Author**

Emma Fitzpatrick

**Date**

04 June 2013

**Meeting with**

Tata Steel

**Venue**

Temple Quay House, Bristol

**Attendees**

Ben Lewis (GVA)  
Craig Stirling (Tata Steel)  
Guy Simms (Tata Steel)  
Catherine Mackay (AECOM)  
Tom Carpen (Principal Case Manager)  
Oliver Blower (Case Manager)  
Helen Lancaster (Senior EIA Advisor)  
Karl-Jonas Johansson (Case Officer)  
Emma Fitzpatrick (Assistant Case Officer)

**Meeting****objectives**

Introductory project meeting for the Internal Power Generation Enhancement for Port Talbot Steelworks

**Circulation**

All Attendees

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

#### Introductions/Overview

Tata Steel stated that it is a major employer in South Wales and that it has a broader objective to increase production at its Port Talbot Steelworks. It considers that this proposed project is a key element to future sustainability and increased energy/economic efficiency, moving towards the steelworks becoming self sufficient in its energy needs.

#### The Project Team

The project team currently is comprised of the applicant (Tata Steel UK Ltd), Planning and Project Management Consultants (GVA) and Technical and Environmental Consultants (AECOM). Further appointments at the appropriate time will be made regarding legal representation and public relations/communications services.

#### The Project

The applicant considers the project to be an enhancement of the existing Port Talbot Steelworks, aiming to increase electrical output from 95.7 MWe to 170-225 MWe.

A consequence of the iron and steelmaking process is the generation of by-product gases which are currently burnt in flare stacks on the site. The primary fuel for the enhancement would be these by-product gases (3 types) and by utilising the already existent fuel source the applicant intends this enhancement to facilitate cost reductions; reductions in reliance on gas/imported fuels, air quality improvements and reduction in the flare.

## **Current Progress**

The applicant is in the process of developing the project design. The applicant confirmed that there has been early engagement between the applicant and the Environment Agency Wales on technical aspects of the proposal, for example water abstraction.

The applicant has submitted its Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to the Local Planning Authority (Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council (NPTCBC)) for comment. Tata has considered how to communicate with hard to reach groups. The Planning Inspectorate advised that auditing all consultation, both formal and informal from an early stage will help the applicant demonstrate how it has complied with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), and pre-application guidance from the Department of Communities and Local Government.

With regards to formal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping, the applicant is in discussion with NPTCBC. Ecological surveys have been undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement however it advised that very little ecology and supporting habitat has been found on site. Viewpoints for the Landscape & Visual Assessment have also been agreed with NPTCBC and photography undertaken to produce the photomontages in the worst case seasonal representation (with trees shown without leaves).

The Planning Inspectorate advised the applicant to demonstrate potential offsite effects, and emphasised the importance of explaining the methodology thoroughly.

## **Timescales**

Tata anticipate submitting the EIA scoping report to the Planning Inspectorate in July 2013, with formal Development Consent Order (DCO) submission in the second half of Q1 2014. However timescales are underpinned by other factors which the applicant advised it is fully sensitive to.

The Planning Inspectorate enquired about other permits which the applicant may need to seek alongside the DCO application. The applicant is aware of the necessary permits, and envisage in some instances, varying existing ones rather than applying wholly for new ones.

The Planning Inspectorate advised that it can review draft documents prior to formal submission. It advised that from experience, an iterative review over 2-3 months tends to be most useful, however a minimum period of 6 weeks should be given to the Inspectorate to enable the review to be done comprehensively. The Planning Inspectorate asked the applicant to build this into their project timescales. The Planning Inspectorate suggested to the developer that it could use its checklist developed to assess applications under section 55 of the Act, as an internal audit prior

to submission to ensure the application was complete. The checklist can be found as an [appendix to Advice Note 6](#).

### **Any Other Business**

The applicant enquired about the Rochdale Envelope principle. The Planning Inspectorate advised that an important consideration when using the Rochdale principles is that enough certainty/information can be supplied to consultees to ensure the consultation is meaningful. It is practical to assess the 'worst case scenario' that the Rochdale Envelope would encompass, and ensure that this is cross-referenced and properly assessed in the Environmental Statement. Further to this, documenting why and how decisions were reached by the applicant and the processes of refinement that they went through are useful to give clarity to the Examining Authority.

The applicant enquired about cumulative impacts assessment. The applicant has contacted NPTCBC and does not believe that there are relevant projects in the area. The applicant enquired about cumulative effects in relation to Tidal Lagoon Swansea Bay. The Planning Inspectorate informed the developer that it is their duty to identify any cumulative effect relating to Tidal Lagoon Swansea bay or any other projects in the area.

**End.**