



## Meeting note

<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Hannah Pratt
<b>Date</b>	21 March 2016
<b>Meeting with</b>	Norfolk Vanguard Steering Group
<b>Venue</b>	Royal HaskoningDHV Offices, Rightwell House, Bretton, Peterborough PE3 8DW
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd (VWPL)</b> Ruari Lean, Kathy Wood <b>Royal HaskoningDHV</b> Alistair Davison, Ruth Henderson, Gemma Keenan <b>The Planning Inspectorate</b> Tom Carpen, Richard Hunt <b>Natural England</b> Louise Burton, Alex Thompson (on phone) <b>Marine Management Organisation (MMO)</b> Frances Edwards, Alan Gibson
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	First Evidence Plan steering group meeting – to discuss proposed approach
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

### Summary of discussions and advice under s51 of PA2008 (as amended)

The group discussed the proposed set up for the Evidence Plan Process (EPP); which would comprise a steering group and topic groups. It was agreed that the role of steering group will be to monitor the EPP and any issues arising from topic groups. It was agreed that there will be approximately six steering group meetings prior to submission of the DCO application (mid 2018) which will be targeted around key project milestones.

The Planning Inspectorate explained that its role will be as an impartial facilitator and that they will offer section 51 where appropriate which they are obliged to publish. It confirmed that there needs to be transparency in who is invited to participate in the process.

An initial draft of Terms of Reference (ToR) was discussed. The Planning Inspectorate advised the following:

- the ToR should set out the process if issues raised at steering group meetings cannot be closed out;

- the draft ToR has timeframe commitments for topic group organisations – the steering group cannot bind these groups to a timescale;
- the need to be clear that the EPP does not force agreement but will document areas of agreement/disagreement to provide transparency in decision-making process; and
- that the one week time allowance for providing information for review may not be adequate, particularly for larger documents.

The applicant explained that Norfolk County Council had expressed some concerns regarding the process; primarily resourcing and impartiality if they are involved in a process led by the developer.

The group discussed the approach to clustering topic groups for efficiency; the need to be careful not to group too many topics as this could result in many people attending long meetings that are not all relevant; and that an option would be provided to join some topic groups remotely to avoid meetings being too onerous.

The Planning Inspectorate advised that the applicant may wish to consider incorporating the Water Framework Directive within the EPP.

The Planning Inspectorate explained that it would keen to see transboundary effects identified during scoping to aid the Planning Inspectorate transboundary screening process. Scoping should provide clear rationale regarding which States should be screened in. If required, the Planning Inspectorate will then consult with transboundary bodies during scoping, acceptance and examination as required. The applicant will also be expected to consult with transboundary bodies prior to submission of the DCO application.