



Meeting note

Project name	East Anglia ONE North (EA1N) and East Anglia TWO (EA2)
File reference	EN010077 and EN010078
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	20 June 2018
Meeting with	Scottish Power Renewables (SPR)
Venue	TQH, Bristol (teleconference)
Meeting objectives	Projects update meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 (s51) of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under s51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Welcome and introductions

The Applicant and the Inspectorate team introduced themselves and their respective roles.

Project update

The Applicant provided an update in regard to the Phase 3 Consultation for both projects which began on 14 May 2018 and will last until 28 August 2018 to allow sufficient time for the members of the public and stakeholders to be involved in the process. Three sets of Public Information Days (PIDs) are scheduled on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. The dates are the 28th/ 29th/ 30th June, 5th/ 6th/ 7th July and 25th/ 26th/27th July. Consultation material for both projects being shown at PIDs will be available on the Applicant's website.

Simultaneous DCO applications

The Applicant confirmed that they are intending to simultaneously submit separate Development Consent Order (DCO) applications in Q4 2019; one application for EA1N and a separate application for EA2. The Applicant requested advice to assist in understanding the procedures that would be available during the examination phase for both projects, including the possibility of holding joint hearings.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that it is possible to submit one application for two Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs), as this has been done successfully in the past for other separate offshore wind farms; therefore the



Inspectorate advised that where possible, one application should be submitted for the two NSIPs. In such instances only one preliminary meeting would be required, and interested parties would only need to provide written responses for one application and attend one set of hearings (where required).

The Inspectorate advised that it is highly unlikely that the same Examining Authority (ExA) will be appointed to examine and report on both applications. Each application is examined in its own right, as a separate entity, and the ExA appointed to each application will only examine and report on the particulars of the application they are dealing with.

The Inspectorate advised that as a result of the above, it could be more challenging for interested parties to engage effectively in both applications if they are submitted separately and simultaneously. This would very likely result in two separate preliminary meetings and two separate sets of (potentially overlapping) deadlines for written submissions and two separate sets of (potentially overlapping) hearings on similar topics. Instead, examining the two projects within one application could lead to efficiencies in how the examination procedures (hearings and written submissions etc) could be handled by one ExA, and also enable interested parties to engage more effectively.

The Inspectorate advised that the Planning Act 2008 does not specifically prescribe for a process where the examination of two separate applications can be considered together; for the practical reasons outlined above joint examinations would be highly unlikely. It is for the ExA to decide how to examine the application and in making any decision about how the application is to be examined they must comply with the relevant provisions of the legislation.

The Applicant provided background to their decision to submit two separate applications at the same time, specifically the need for both projects to be separate and independent of one another to facilitate further funding and deliverability of the projects; and that both applications would be submitted by separate limited companies. Given the geographic overlap of the onshore works, as well as some of the offshore works, and the benefits in an improved understanding of cumulative impacts, the Applicant considers there to be potential advantages to an intensive yet combined process. The Applicant also advised that it was reviewing measures (such as the structure of the applications or provision of a 'signposting' document) in order to assist in stakeholders' efficient review of both documents.

The Applicant confirmed that it will be discussing this matter with the stakeholders. The Applicant advised that it will seek comments and input from the Local Authorities to update the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to reflect the changed programme of statutory consultation and potential joint submission.

The Inspectorate requested that the Applicant provides information to justify their approach and explains the potential resource implications to the relevant consultees and potential interested parties. The Inspectorate also highlighted the potential resource implications on the Applicant in responding to separate ExA written questions, providing multiple written submissions and attending separate hearings. The Applicant acknowledged this.



Specific decisions/ follow-up required

The Applicant will provide further information and reasons for submitting the two projects along identical timelines.