



## Meeting note

<b>File reference</b>	EN010071
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Stephanie Newman
<b>Date</b>	4 September 2015
<b>Meeting with</b>	North London Heat and Power Project
<b>Venue</b>	Teleconference
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Planning Inspectorate</b> Tom Carpen (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Stephanie Newman (Case Manager) Melanie Bischer (Consents Service Unit) Will Spencer (EIA Advisor) Emma Cottam (EIA Advisor) <b>Applicant</b> Euston Ling (NLWA) Ursula Taylor (NLWA) Nicola White (Arup) Anita Kasseean (Stephenson Harwood)
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project update
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees.

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

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) outlined its openness policy and ensured those present understood that any issues discussed and advice given would be recorded and placed on the Inspectorate's website under s.51 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008). Further to this, it was made clear that any advice given did not constitute legal advice upon which the applicant (or others) can rely.

The Inspectorate explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss and obtain an update from the applicant on a number of issues identified by the Inspectorate throughout the course of pre-application, and, without prejudice to any examination, advise on how to address any issues in order to reduce the risk of possible problems arising at the acceptance stage or any examination.

### Inspectorate comments on draft documents

The applicant sought a general view from the Inspectorate on the quality of the application and the level of risk approaching submission

The Inspectorate advised that all its comments were without prejudice to the Acceptance process; however it had sought to highlight areas where the application

documents could be improved ahead of any examination. The applicant was advised that overall, the documents it had seen to date had taken account of pre-application advice and discussions and were well structured. The applicant was advised to pay particular to comments on the draft Development Consent Order comments and the consistency between the DCO, Environmental Statement and consultation report.

### **Update on specific issues**

#### *Engagement with London Borough (LB) of Haringey*

The Inspectorate requested an update on engagement with LB Haringey, given they had not submitted a formal response to the s. 42 consultation. The applicant explained that although LB Haringey had not provided a formal submission to the consultation, they have engaged with the applicant since the close of the consultation period and have not raised any issues.

#### *Progress with LB Enfield on design*

The Inspectorate requested an update on progress with LB Enfield, and whether in the applicant's view they were content with the Rochdale Envelope mechanism as written in the DCO and assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES). The applicant reported that they have been having further discussions about their design code principles; that they met in August to discuss the Design and Access Statement; and it is their understanding that LB Enfield is satisfied with the Rochdale Envelope approach and the limits of deviation.

#### *Combined heat and power (CHP)*

The Inspectorate requested an update on discussions with the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the Lee Valley Heat Network (LVHN) with regards to CHP. The applicant explained discussions are ongoing with the GLA and LVHN on technical matters and confirmed that they would be in the position to supply required heat (although there are cost implications of accommodating these requirements). The Inspectorate advised that the applicant's CHP strategy should demonstrate how it is in accordance the relevant National Policy Statements.

#### *Traffic and transport*

The Inspectorate requested an update on discussions with Transport for London (TfL) on traffic and transport issues. The applicant reported that they have been holding meetings with TfL, and held a site visit for TfL to inspect the wharf area. The applicant confirmed that TfL have not expressed any objections to the proposed scheme and they have subsequently sent TfL a draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) for consideration.

#### *s.106 agreements including local labour*

The applicant provided an update on the progress in drafting a s.106 agreement with LB Enfield: draft wording has been provided by the applicant, taking into account local policies which Enfield had directed them towards. The applicant advised that discussions were ongoing and positive.

#### *Noise assessment*

The Inspectorate requested an update concerning discussions between the applicant and the Environment Agency (EA) regarding the noise assessment. The applicant

reported that they had provided the EA with an updated noise assessment, and will be seeking their planning comments, with a meeting scheduled for late September. The applicant confirmed that correspondence between the Inspectorate and the EA would feed into their permit application and SoCG.

#### *Health impacts*

The Inspectorate enquired about the applicant's engagement with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), and whether they had performed a health impact assessment. The applicant noted that the HSE had responded to the consultation and the applicant was satisfied with this degree of input at this stage (HSE did not appear to have any concerns). The applicant noted that they had prepared a health impact assessment for submission with the application and that this aligns with the ES.

#### *Cumulative impacts and in-combination effects*

The Inspectorate enquired about the steps the applicant had taken to ensure that all relevant projects had been included in their assessment of cumulative impacts and in-combination effects. The applicant noted that they had periodically reviewed these to ensure the list of projects was up to date and that this process was set out during the scoping for the EIA.

#### *Flood risk*

To provide an update on discussions related to flood risk, the applicant explained that the topic had been discussed with LB Enfield (the local lead drainage authority) and the EA, and they had taken their comments onboard.

#### *Flue gas emissions*

The Inspectorate enquired as to whether the applicant had finalised the choice between two options for dealing with flue gas (combined versus wet system). The applicant stated that a cost benefit analysis was being undertaken to inform the decision, but that both options have an almost identical gas cleaning performance (within the assessed envelope) and the decision can therefore be taken in the detailed design phase.

#### *Compulsory acquisition of special category land*

The Inspectorate notes that the applicant seeks exemption from Special Parliamentary Procedure (SPP) for the compulsory acquisition of Open Space land on the grounds that the land will be no less advantageous than it was before, under s.132(3) of the Planning Act. The Inspectorate advised that should the application be accepted, the consideration of the exemption from SPP would be performed by the Examining Authority within the examination. To inform an assessment of the case it is therefore advisable to fully justify, in the Statement of Reasons, why the land will be no less advantageous than it was before.

#### **Specific decisions / follow up required**

The applicant confirmed that it would be submitting the draft DCO, Explanatory Memorandum and Statement of Reasons to the Inspectorate for a second review shortly. Other draft documents (Grid Connection Statement, No Significant Effects

Report, Consultation Report and Funding Statement) were being completed and would also be submitted for review in the near future. It was agreed that more precise timings would follow by email.

The applicant also offered to provide the Inspectorate with a roadmap document setting out the compulsory acquisition powers sought against the relevant articles in the DCO and the relevant plots on the plans, in order to aid the examination process.