

The Meaford Energy (Gas Fired Power Station) Order

10.10: Written Summary of MEL's Oral Case put at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing of 12 November 2015

Planning Act 2008 The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

PINS Reference Number:	EN010064
Document Reference Number:	10.10
Regulation Number:	N/A
Lead Author:	Pinsent Masons

Revision:	Date:	Description:
0	November 2015	Examination version

**WRITTEN SUMMARY OF MEAFORD ENERGY LIMITED'S (THE
"APPLICANT") ORAL CASE PUT AT THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION
HEARING OF 12 NOVEMBER 2015**

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

- 1.1 This document summarises the Applicant's case as presented at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (the "CA Hearing") held on 12 November 2015 at Yarnfield Conference Centre.
- 1.2 The note addresses each of the agenda items set by the Examining Authority, as published on the Planning Inspectorate's website on 5 November 2015 (the "Agenda"). Issues on which submissions were made are grouped under the headings provided in the Agenda.

2. INTRODUCTION OF THE PARTICIPATING PARTIES

2.1 Speaking on behalf of the Applicant:-

- 2.1.1 Richard Griffiths (Partner at Pinsent Masons LLP).

3. AGENDA ITEM 2: UPDATE ON THE CURRENT POSITION/NEGOTIATION WITH INTERESTED PARTIES

- 3.1 Mr Griffiths explained that there are only two plots which are subject to compulsory acquisition under the Development Consent Order ("DCO"), being plots:
- 3.1.1 GC3 (Railway Bridge 104) which is owned by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited ("Network Rail") and over which Western Power Distribution (West Midlands) Plc ("WPD") has a Category 2 interest in respect of electricity apparatus; and
- 3.1.2 GC5 (Canal Bridge 101 (Malkin's Bridge)) which it has now been established is owned by the Canal & River Trust ("CRT") and over which WPD also has a Category 2 interest in respect of electricity apparatus.
- 3.2 The Applicant has applied to create rights and impose restrictions over both plots

Network Rail

- 3.3 Mr Griffiths explained that the Applicant has completed a Network Rail development questionnaire in April 2014; applied for Land Clearance (which was obtained on 25 September 2014); and agreed a Basic Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail on 2 March 2015.
- 3.4 Mr Griffiths explained that the Applicant is in negotiations with Network Rail regarding an option for an easement over Railway Bridge 104. [**Applicant Note:** *Please see Annex 1 to this document for a summary of negotiations undertaken to date*]. Heads of Terms have been passed to the Applicant for discussion but this is minus the financial consideration required. The Applicant has issued its own financial offer to Network Rail on 11 November 2015 in order to progress discussions to an agreement.
- 3.5 Protective provisions have been agreed subject to a side agreement being agreed.
- 3.6 **S127 and S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that based on these points, the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Planning Act 2008 (the "Act") was

necessary for the purposes of the development (the Gas Pipeline needs to cross the bridge in order to get to the Local Transmission System for the fuel supply for the Power Station Complex) and any rights can be purchased without any serious detriment to the carrying on of Network Rail's undertaking [**Applicant Note: Network Rail does not own any land on either side of this bridge and therefore has no beneficial use of the bridge**]. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 127 and section 138 of the Act.

Canal & Rivers Trust ("CRT")

- 3.7 Sections 127 and 138 apply to the CRT.
- 3.8 As with Network Rail, Mr Griffiths explained that the Applicant is in negotiations with CRT regarding an option for an easement over Canal Bridge 101. [**Applicant Note: Please see Annex 1 to this document for a summary of negotiations undertaken to date**]. Heads of Terms and a financial offer have not yet been passed to the Applicant for discussion. The Applicant has issued its own financial offer to CRT on 11 November 2015 in order to try to speed this process up.
- 3.9 As with Network Rail, Mr Griffiths confirmed that protective provisions are included in the DCO for the protection of CRT. No response has been received from CRT on the content of protective provisions and these have not been agreed by CRT, although the Applicant has been in discussions with CRT for some time.
- 3.10 Mr Griffiths explained that the protective provisions included in Rev 1 of the DCO were drafted on the assumption that a side agreement would be in place by this point in the Examination. However, no agreement has yet been reached. As such, amended protective provisions reflecting this position are being inserted into Rev 2 of DCO (to be submitted to the Examination at Deadline 4 on 19 November 2015). The Applicant has issued its own financial offer to CRT on 11 November 2015 in order to progress discussions to an agreement. Hopefully agreement can be reached and in that case, the agreed protective provisions will be included in the final version of the Order.
- 3.11 It was explained that the Gas Pipeline will oversail Canal Bridge 101 (Malkin's Bridge) and will not touch the deck of the bridge.
- 3.12 **S127 and S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Act is necessary for the purposes of the development and any rights can be purchased without any serious detriment to the carrying on of CRT's undertaking [**Applicant Note: CRT does not own any land on either side of this bridge and therefore has no beneficial use of it. Additionally, part of the bridge structure is also on land owned by St Modwen, a 50% owner of MEL. Annex 2 shows the location of the bridge and extent of ownerships**]. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 127 and section 138 of the Act.

WPD

- 3.13 Mr Griffiths confirmed that WPD issued a letter to the Examination on 9 November 2015 (Examination Library Reference: REP2-010) summarising their position on the compulsory acquisition and that negotiations were ongoing between the parties regarding protective provisions and a side agreement.
- 3.14 It was stated that sections 127 and 138 apply to WPD.
- 3.15 **S127 and S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Act is necessary for the purposes of the development and any rights can be purchased without any serious detriment to the carrying on of WPD's

undertaking. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 127 and section 138 of the Act.

National Grid Gas Plc ("NGG")

- 3.16 In relation to the interests of NGG, Mr Griffiths explained that NGG are included in Parts 2 and 3 of the Book of Reference (Examination Library Reference: APP-022).
- 3.17 It was stated that the parties are close to reaching agreement on the protective provisions for NGG as well as an accompanying side agreement.
- 3.18 Section 127 of the Act does not apply to NGG as the Applicant is not intending to compulsorily acquire any land or rights belonging to NGG.
- 3.19 **S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Act is necessary for the purposes of the development. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 138 of the Act.

SP Manweb Plc ("SPM")

- 3.20 Mr Griffiths confirmed that SPM requested protective provisions regarding access to a pylon that is located outside of the Order limits. Protective provisions to cover this request have been included in the DCO.
- 3.21 As with NGG, only section 138 of the Act applies to SPM.
- 3.22 **S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Act is necessary for the purposes of the development. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 138 of the Act.

TELECOMMUNICATION STATUTORY UNDERTAKERS

British Telecommunications Plc ("BT")

- 3.23 Mr Griffiths stated that the protective provisions for the benefit of BT have been drafted to align with BT's 'Special requirements when working in the vicinity of Openreach apparatus' sent by BT to the Applicant on 27 April 2015.
- 3.24 As far as the Applicant is aware, the amended protective provisions deal with BT's request. BT has not responded to the Applicant's requests for confirmation that this is the case. The Applicant will continue to seek this confirmation.
- 3.25 Only section 138 of the Act applies to BT.
- 3.26 **S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Act is necessary for the purposes of the development. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 138 of the Act.
- 3.27 Mr Griffiths explained that section 127 does not apply to BT, as telecommunications providers do not fall within the definition of "statutory undertaker" under that section.

Colt Telecom Limited ("Colt")

- 3.28 It was confirmed that Colt is not classified as a statutory undertaker pursuant to section 127 of the Act. As such, only section 138 of the Act applies to Colt.

- 3.29 Specific provisions for telecommunications providers have been included at Schedule 7 of the DCO.
- 3.30 **[Applicant Note:** *It was confirmed in the DCO Hearing of 12 November 2015 that Colt and the Applicant had communicated regarding the protective provisions for telecommunications providers contained in the DCO and Colt had confirmed in October 2014 that no other specific provisions needed to be included to protect Colt]*
- 3.31 **S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Act is necessary for the purposes of the development. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 138 of the Act.

KCOM Group Plc ("KCOM")

- 3.32 It was confirmed that KCOM is not classified as a statutory undertaker pursuant to section 127 of the Act. As such, only section 138 of the Act applies to KCOM.
- 3.33 Specific provisions for telecommunications providers have been included at Schedule 7 of the DCO.
- 3.34 **[Applicant Note:** *It was confirmed in the DCO Hearing of 12 November 2015 that KCOM has not responded to any communications from the Applicant to date regarding the draft protective provisions]*
- 3.35 **S138:** Mr Griffiths explained that the Secretary of State can be satisfied that any extinguishment, suspension or removal of a relevant right within the meaning of section 138 of the Act is necessary for the purposes of the development. Given this, the Secretary of State can be satisfied of the matters set out in section 138 of the Act.
- 3.36 **The Trustees of The Barlaston Bowls and Tennis Club ("the Trustees")**
- 3.37 The Trustees are included within Parts 2 and 3 of the Book of Reference due to their access to the Bowling Green, which is currently exercised over the Northern Access Road.
- 3.38 The Trustees have confirmed to the Applicant that they are content with the proposals as set out by the Applicant and the reassurances that they have been given by the Applicant in this regard.
- 3.39 **[Applicant Note:** *A copy of the written communication from the Trustees to the Applicant is attached at Annex 3 to this document]*

4. AGENDA ITEM 3: MATTERS STILL TO BE RESOLVED AFTER DEADLINE 2 & 3 SUBMISSIONS

- 4.1 Mr Griffiths gave the following brief summary of the matters the Applicant is working to resolve. The Applicant will:
- 4.1.1 continue liaising with Network Rail regarding a property/side agreement and protective provisions such that Network Rail can submit a representation removing its objection as soon as possible;
 - 4.1.2 continue liaising with CRT regarding a property/side agreement and protective provisions such that CRT can submit a representation removing its objection as soon as possible;
 - 4.1.3 continue liaising with WPD regarding a side agreement and protective provisions such that WPD can submit a representation removing its objection as soon as possible;

- 4.1.4 continue liaising with NGG regarding a side agreement and protective provisions such that NGG can submit a representation removing its objection as soon as possible;
 - 4.1.5 continue to seek written confirmation from BT regarding the amended protective provisions drafted for its benefit;
 - 4.1.6 continue to seek a response from KCOM regarding the protective provisions for the benefit of telecommunications providers.
- 4.2 The Applicant considers that there is no further action required in relation to the following:
- 4.2.1 The Trustees of The Barlaston Bowls and Tennis Club, as agreement has been reached;
 - 4.2.2 Colt, as agreement to the protective provisions has been confirmed; or
 - 4.2.3 SPM's request to protect access to its pylon has been incorporated into the DCO through the protective provisions.
5. **AGENDA ITEM 4: LIABILITY (IF ANY) FOR COMPENSATION TO LOCAL RESIDENTS**
- 5.1 It was acknowledged that this agenda item is not a compulsory purchase issue.
- 5.2 Mr Griffiths confirmed that the Applicant's position is that which it set out in its Deadline Three submissions, being (in brief) that impacts on property values are not a material consideration for the Secretary of State. In respect of any other compensation that may be payable, for example under s10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 or s152 of the Act, the Applicant does not consider it likely that a claim would arise. Both these sections relate to construction impacts.
- 5.3 Mr Griffiths went on to explain that under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, compensation may be payable in relation to the use of a project but there must be an impact arising from a physical factor, such as noise or dust, rather than effects on a view. The Applicant does not consider it likely that a claim under Part 1 would arise.
- 5.4 It was confirmed that there is a mechanism under existing legislation to enable a third party to make a claim, not being listed in the Book of Reference does not preclude this. However, given the assessment set out in the Environmental Statement, the Applicant does not consider that there will be any such claims. Any claims that were made would be dealt with in the usual way.
- 5.5 **OTHER – PROCEDURAL QUERY**
- 5.6 Mr Griffiths highlighted to the Examining Authority that there are dates reserved for further issue specific hearings on 16 and 17 December 2015. It was stated that should the Examining Authority wish to hold these hearings, the Applicant would be required by procedure to submit notifications to the press twenty-one days in advance of these hearings. Due to the publication dates of the local newspaper (Thursday 19 November 2015), this would mean that the Applicant would have to submit its notices to the local newspaper by 17 November 2015. In order to draft the notices, the Applicant would therefore need to know by the end of 16 November 2015 whether or not the Hearings are going to go ahead.
- 5.7 Mr Griffiths noted that the Examining Authority has the discretion to reduce the period of twenty-one days. Mr Griffiths requested that, if the Examining Authority was unable to confirm by 16 November 2015 whether the Hearings were to be held in December, then this discretion be used to reduce the twenty-one day period.

5.8 In response to a question from the Examining Authority, Mr Griffiths confirmed that it is the Applicant's view that further Hearings are not necessary; all issues raised thus far have been adequately addressed through representations and the November Hearings; and any additional queries or questions could be dealt with through written submissions and/or the second round of Examining Authority questions.

ANNEX ONE

Summary of Negotiations Undertaken to Date with Network Rail and CRT

Land rights negotiations with CRT

DATE	FORM OF COMMUNICATION	CONTENT
10/04/14	Letter from the Applicant	The letter provided an introduction to the Scheme, description of the gas connection, a description of the interaction with CRT land, drawing and photograph enclosures and the history of use of the bridge. The Applicant requested discussions with CRT.
01/05/14	Email from CRT	Email from CRT providing contact details for the Utilities Surveyor and Asset Protection Engineer allocated to deal with this case on behalf of CRT.
14/05/14	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant emailed requesting a meeting date to discuss the Scheme with CRT.
28/08/14	Meeting between the Parties	The meeting comprised introductions, a description of the Scheme and respective organisations. There was discussion regarding the various canal bridges in this area and ownership thereof. CRT stated that Canal Bridge 101 was not in its ownership. In addition, there was discussion over the proposed method of crossing and preferred works periods.
26/02/15	Meeting between the Parties	This was a meeting to discuss both parties' investigations into the ownership of Canal Bridge 101. There was also further discussion over the design of the Scheme and the attendees reviewed the latest version of the Works Plans. CRT gave a summary of its ownership investigation on Canal Bridge 101. Assuming its ownership, CRT confirmed that it would be prepared to discuss voluntary agreement for rights to cross the bridge, including any necessary repairs. There was also a discussion regarding the DCO application timescale and inclusion of Compulsory Purchase powers.
24/03/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant made a request for an update on determining ownership of Canal Bridge 101. Once received, the Applicant confirmed it would like a meeting to discuss terms.
02/04/15	Email from CRT	CRT confirmed that it had received legal advice regarding ownership of Canal Bridge 101 and suggested dates for a meeting to discuss the terms of a crossing agreement.
23/04/15	Meeting between the Parties	The Applicant updated CRT on the project timescale and that the DCO had been submitted to PINS. Extracts of the Book of Reference, the Land Plan, the Scheme description and drawings were tabled by the Applicant. The Applicant advised of the s56 notification process (should the application be accepted for examination). CRT confirmed its ownership of Canal Bridge 101 and that the registered title and the CRT maintenance

		programme would be updated to include Canal Bridge 101. The Applicant and CRT then had a discussion regarding the form of agreement required and CRT's internal approval processes in accordance with the Charities Act. CRT confirmed that it would instruct a valuation of the rights required to be undertaken and provide a proposal to the Applicant.
07/05/15	Email from the Applicant	The email attached the minutes of previous meeting, and confirmed that a 125+ year Lease of Easement would be acceptable in principle. It also clarified St Modwen's and the Applicant's existing rights to use Canal Bridge 102, (located to the North), as well as informing CRT that the DCO application had been accepted for examination.
15/05/15	Email from CRT	CRT confirmed its approval of the minutes and that an external valuer had been instructed. CRT suggested that the Heads of Terms would be available by the end of May.
13/08/15	Email from CRT	Update on valuation report progress. A meeting to discuss the Heads of Terms was suggested.
13/08/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant requested that a particular member of CRT's staff also be available to meet to discuss the Protective Provisions.
03/09/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant requested meeting dates. It also provided a link to the Scheme's webpage on the PINS website
24/09/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant requested that draft Heads of Terms be proposed in advance of the arranged meeting on 8 October 2015.
01/10/15	Email from CRT	CRT emailed to postpone the arranged meeting as a key member of staff was not available to discuss the Protective Provisions and the valuation report was not complete.
06/10/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant requested the draft Heads of Terms, whilst the valuation report was being finalised. The Applicant advised of dates for the DCO and CPO examination hearings. A date for a meeting to discuss the Protective Provisions was made.
07/10/15	Email from the Applicant	A further request for Heads of Terms was made by the Applicant, along with the detailing of the benefit of progressing both land rights negotiations and agreement on Protective Provisions before the DCO and CPO hearings if possible.
15/10/15	Meeting between the Parties	This was a meeting to discuss a crossing agreement. No draft Heads of Terms, Lease of Easement or financial proposal had yet been received by the Applicant. The requested member of CRT's staff was not present at the meeting to discuss the Protective Provisions.
11/11/15	Letter to CRT	Letter sent by the Applicant to CRT requesting draft HoT's, draft Lease of Easement, clarifying position regarding s127 of the PA2008, making financial offer for the rights and restrictions required by the

		Applicant, and also requesting a response on the Protective Provisions for the benefit of CRT.
--	--	--

Additional communication regarding Protective Provisions (in addition to the references above)

04/10/14	Email to CRT	The Applicant requested a dialogue regarding the Protective Provisions.
16/10/14	As above	As above.
29/01/15	As above	As above.
13/08/15	Email to a different member of staff at CRT	The Applicant asked whether a particular member of staff would also be available to meet to discuss the Protective Provisions.
07/10/15	Email to CRT	The email requested a review of the Protective Provisions, comments on such and any suggested amends so agreement can be reached. Attached was a further copy of draft Protective Provisions for ease of reference.

Land rights negotiations with Network Rail

DATE	FORM OF COMMUNICATION	CONTENT
10/04/14	Email (and attachments) from the Applicant	The Applicant sent to Network Rail the Development Questionnaire, with plans and photographs appended.
11/04/14	Email from Network Rail	Network Rail confirmed that the case had been allocated to an Asset Protection Engineer.
25/04/14	Email from Network Rail	The Asset Protection Engineer requested some clarification on the historic use of Rail Bridge 104 and the proposed crossing method.
19/05/14	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant answered some high level engineering/design questions.
24/06/14	Email from Network Rail	The email confirmed Network Rail's receipt of the s42 consultation material. It also sought clarification of historical rights over the bridge.
24/06/14	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant provided clarification of the historic rights over the bridge as requested.
25/06/14	Email from Network Rail	Network Rail provided general guidance on the process to obtain rights to work and site pipeline on Network Rail land, namely asset protection approvals and land rights approvals, including Land Clearance in order to initiate discussions over a voluntary crossing agreement.
25/06/14	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant confirmed that it would like to apply for Land Clearance by completing a Schedule of Information.
22/07/14	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant submitted the Schedule of Information.
06/08/14	Email from the	A request for an update on Land Clearance was

	Applicant	made by the Applicant.
06/08/15	Email from the Applicant	The email clarified queries raised by Network Rail regarding use of the rail network for the construction and operation of the Scheme. The Applicant in turn queried the delay in obtaining Land Clearance.
25/09/14	Email from Network Rail	Network Rail confirmed that Land Clearance had now been issued for the crossing for the benefit of the Applicant and that technical approval had been granted subject to further design and engineering approvals. Network Rail advised that the next step was for valuation of the rights so that commercial negotiations could commence and proceed to documentation.
06/10/14	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant confirmed that Land Clearance had been obtained. A request to progress to completion of the Basic Asset Protection Agreement ("BAPA") was made.
07/10/14	Email from Network Rail	This was an email exchange regarding the BAPA.
09/10/14	Email from the Applicant	The email attached the Customer Application Form ("CAF") and requested the draft BAPA.
09/10/14	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant requested standard Network Rail Protective Provisions and draft terms for the crossing rights.
22/10/14	Email from Network Rail	Draft Protective Provisions were provided by Network Rail's legal team.
04/11/14	Email from the Applicant	The email requested details of the new Network Rail case manager, as previous manager had moved department.
04/11/15	Email from Network Rail	The previous manager provided the name of the new manager along with contact details.
29/01/15	Email from the Applicant	The email summarised the current position on Land Clearance and Asset Protection. The Applicant also requested a crossing agreement proposal from Network Rail.
02/03/15	Letter from the Applicant	The signed BAPA was sent to the Asset Protection Engineer.
15/04/15	Email from the Applicant	The email provided an update on the project timescale and requested discussions regarding the crossing rights between the Applicant and Network Rail.
09/06/15	Email from Network Rail	A different Network Rail employee confirmed that he has taken over the case. He sought clarification of the proposed crossing location.
10/06/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant confirmed the crossing location and gave a background to the discussions so far.
10/06/15	Email from Network Rail	The email suggested that a proposal would be received by the Applicant by the following week.
10-22/06/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant requested an update on the timescale for receiving the proposal.
31/07/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant made a further request for an update on the timescale of receiving the proposal. It also

		provided an update on the DCO examination timescale.
07/08/15	Email from Network Rail	Network Rail informed the Applicant that there had been a misunderstanding with his land agent and that it would get the proposal to the Applicant as soon as possible.
13/08/15	Email from Network Rail	Network Rail confirmed that the land agent had inspected the crossing location.
03/09/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant made a further request for an update on the timescale of receiving the proposal. It also provided an update on the DCO examination timescale.
24/09/15	Exchange of emails between the parties	Network Rail confirmed that it was still awaiting an update from the land agent and that the proposal was not ready.
07/10/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant expressed disappointment at the lack of progress in 12 months since requesting the proposal. The Applicant requested the draft Heads of Terms and provided an update on the DCO examination timescale including DCO and CPO hearings.
15/10/15	Email and attachments from Network Rail	Network Rail sent the Applicant the draft Heads of Terms. The draft Lease of Easement financial consideration was not included. The Applicant was advised that it would follow separately from the land agent.
27/10/15	Email from the Applicant	The Applicant requested the proposed financial consideration for the crossing right, so it can be reviewed alongside other terms set out in Heads of Terms.
11/11/15	Letter to Network Rail	Letter sent by the Applicant to Network Rail querying why the financial offer had not been forthcoming, clarifying position regarding s127 of the PA2008 and making financial offer for the rights and restrictions required by the Applicant.

Discussions regarding protective provisions have been progressing as between the two legal teams and are not summarised here.

ANNEX TWO

Plan showing the location of Canal Bridge 101 and the extent of ownerships



- Legend**
- Order Limits
 - Land owned by St Modwen
 - Land owned by the Canal and River Trust
 - LIDAR Survey of Bridge Deck

Revisions

Revision	Date

Drawn: **Meaford Energy Limited** 17/11/15

Document Reference:
AP17 Registration

Drawing Title:
Meaford Energy Centre
Ownership Drawing with LIDAR
Bridge Survey

Scale 100 @ A3

ANNEX THREE

Communication from the Trustees of The Barlaston Bowls and Tennis Club

**Barlaston Bowling and Tennis Club
Meaford**

**Pam Bedford, Secretary
4 Chapel Court
Barlaston
ST12 9PA**

April 2nd 2015

To, Meaford Energy Centre

I confirm that we have been informed about the works to be carried out to the northern access road as part of the Meaford Energy centre works. We also understand that access to the Bowling Club will be maintained during the works and we are happy with these arrangements.

Pam Bedford (Secretary)