



## Meeting note

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Project name</b>       | East Anglia TWO and East Anglia ONE North |
| <b>File reference</b>     | EN010077 and EN010078                     |
| <b>Status</b>             | <b>Final</b>                              |
| <b>Author</b>             | The Planning Inspectorate                 |
| <b>Date</b>               | 18 February 2019                          |
| <b>Meeting with</b>       | ScottishPower Renewables                  |
| <b>Venue</b>              | Temple Quay House                         |
| <b>Meeting objectives</b> | Project Update Meeting                    |
| <b>Circulation</b>        | 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 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which the Developer (or others) could rely.

### ***Consultation***

The Developer provided an update on the simultaneous Phase 4 statutory consultation for both projects which was running from 11 February 2019 to 26 March 2019. This had involved thirteen public information days. The Inspectorate explained that it had received a lot of correspondence during this period (most of which had also been addressed to the Developer), particularly in relation to the choice of substation location. The Developer said the reasoning for this decision could be found on the Phase 3.5 part of its consultation website within the Connection and Infrastructure Options Note (CION) document.

### ***Project update***

The Developer explained that the Preliminary Environmental Statement (PEIR) was a full draft Environmental Statement (ES) and gave an overview of the contents of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The Developer said it was refining onshore boundaries for the cable corridor. This was based on a variety of constraints as well as responses to statutory consultation.

### ***Programme***

The Developer spoke about when it intended to submit both applications and whether they would be submitted simultaneously or slightly apart. The Inspectorate advised that the greater the gap in submissions the better, the preference would be for a sufficient gap for only one examination to take place at a time. The Developer clarified that it was not intending to have a gap of that length of time, and that the applications would be



submitted at the same time or much closer together. The Inspectorate advised that submitting the applications at the same time would be preferable to a scenario where there is a short gap between the two. As this may enable the Inspectorate to try and arrange the examinations in such a way that minimises resource implications use for all parties involved.

## ***Evidence Plan Process***

The Developer said it had held evidence plan group (EPG) meetings to coincide with the publication of the PEIR. These were largely about explaining what information had been provided, as well as a high level run through of impacts. The Developer explained that discussion was limited as it was allowing time for the stakeholders to provide responses to the statutory consultation. The Inspectorate queried whether any stakeholders had commented on the two consultations happening simultaneously. The Developer replied that within the EPG meeting it had provided a signposting document that highlighted differences and similarities between the two projects. This document was not part of the formal section 42 process.

The Developer talked about discussions with the developers for Hornsea 3 and Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm proposals. The Inspectorate asked whether discussions regarding methodology are feeding into the evidence plan process. The Developer's response was that it was recording them to form the basis for Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and would be highlighting this through agreement logs. It noted that some stakeholders are not likely to sign-off SoCG pre-application.

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

The following actions were agreed:

- For a meeting to be arranged by the Developer between the Inspectorate, the Developer and Local Planning Authorities