



Meeting note

File reference	EN010081
Status	Final
Author	Karl-Jonas Johansson
Date	8 November 2016
Meeting with	Eggborough Power Limited
Venue	Telecon
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate: Tom Carpen (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Richard Kent (EIA and Land Advisor) Stephanie Newman (EIA and Land Advisor) Karl-Jonas Johansson (Case Officer) Eggborough Power Limited James Crankshaw (Eggborough Power Limited) Jason Morris (Eggborough Power Limited) Geoff Bullock (Dalton Warner Davis LLP) Keith Bradshaw Richard Lowe (AECOM) Jonathan Riley (Pinsent Masons) Helen Ainscough
Meeting objectives	Project update meeting
Circulation	All attendees.

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

The Applicant and the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) case team introduced themselves and their respective roles. The Inspectorate continued by outlining 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.

General project update

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that it was preparing for the stage 2 statutory consultation in 2017 and confirmed that they had finalised where the power station would be located (coal yard option) and preferred gas pipeline option (east of the River Aire weir).

Feedback and follow up from 'round table' meeting

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that the meeting had improved their working relationship with the statutory consultees and had facilitated progress on a wide range of issues. The Inspectorate advised that they found the site visit and meeting very worthwhile and felt that there was positive discussion around how to resolve potential issues.

Peaking Plant clarification

The applicant clarified that the peaking plant would work as both a Black Start plant and a peaking plant with the capacity to generate between 50 and 299MW. The Applicant intends to use the Rochdale envelope when designing the peaking plant as it could employ either open cycle gas turbine (OCGT) technology or reciprocating engines. The peaking plant would not use the main power station's cooling system as both the OCGT and reciprocating engines would be air cooled. The peaking plant would be housed in one building of fixed dimensions, which could restrict the number of reciprocating engines housed. The building would only have one stack to mitigate the visual impact. The Applicant explained that the worst case scenarios for the peaking plant would be assessed for an output of 299MW for both technologies.

It was clarified that the worst case scenario for emissions would be calculated on the basis that both the peaking plant and the combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT) plant would be running at the same time despite the fact that this might not be possible to do when the project is up and running.

The Applicant was advised to be clear in the environmental statement (ES) on what had been assessed and that the powers sought in the draft development consent order (DCO) would allow for sufficient flexibility. The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that it is continuing to explore DCO wording with its legal advisors.

Decommissioning

The potential cumulative impact of the decommissioning of the existing power station and the construction and operation of the new CCGT plant was recognised as a key issue in the ES, particularly with regards to the landscape and visual, noise, air quality, and the transport topic assessments. For the latter three topics, the Applicant explained that it would be considering a worst case scenario of simultaneous decommissioning and construction. For the landscape and visual assessment, they were seeking views from statutory consultees with regards to the baseline, and were planning to consider a range of scenarios. It was agreed that the Inspectorate would provide the applicant with further written advice regarding the decommissioning of the coal fired power station.

Post meeting note: Advice requested and provided on 11 December 2016 ([link](#))

Above ground installation and access road

The Applicant explained that following the site visit and discussion with the local authorities at the round table meeting, it was investigating the suitability of the road through the village of Burn. In particular it was considering how to ensure access to the above ground installation in a way that minimises the effect on the community.

The Applicant was considering the need for highways works, or alternatively, whether to propose temporary access to avoid the village. The Applicant indicated that they would be holding a consultation event in the village during the stage 2 consultation, and would be drawing the attention of the community to the access and highways issues.

Flood risk

According to the Applicant's assessment of the site no part of the proposed project is in flood risk zone 3, except for the temporary laydown area to be located in the former lagoon. However the Environment Agency (EA) has not yet confirmed in writing that it agrees with the Applicant's flood assessment. If the EA agrees with the Applicant's assessment, this issue will be covered in their statement of common ground.

Marine Licence

The applicant advised that it would need to tunnel under the River Aire for the gas connection and discharge water into the River. The river is tidal at both these locations and the Applicant had sought the advice of the Marine Management Organisation, who also attended the site visit and round table meeting, to see if a marine licence was needed for either. The Applicant confirmed that the water outfall pipeline would require a marine license and that tunnel under the river Aire may do, and that the DCO would contain a deemed marine licence as a result.

Draft documents review

The applicant confirmed that they intended to submit the application documents for review in mid-March 2017. Depending on the outcome of the review the Applicant would then decide whether a second review would be necessary. The Inspectorate informed the Applicant about the normal timescales for the review (three weeks to review the documents with a meeting in Bristol the following week). The possibility of doing the meeting as a teleconference was discussed.

It was clarified that the Inspectorate does not routinely review the ES. However due to the complexity with the EIA baseline with regards to the decommissioning of the old plant, the Inspectorate offered to review the specific parts of the ES that considered the effects of decommissioning. It was agreed that the Applicant would supply the Inspectorate with a memo consolidating the sections on decommissioning as the information would not be contained in one discrete chapter of the ES. It was agreed that this would be shared early and the advice issued as written s51 advice.

Surveys

The agricultural land surveys are scheduled to commence late November early December 2016.

Compulsory Acquisition

The Applicant confirmed that their land agent was working on identifying the various land owners affected by the project. It was also confirmed that the agent was able to produce the schedule the Inspectorate had requested of the Applicant at the meeting held on 11 October 2016.

Heritage

It was confirmed that the pipeline route was being refined to minimise impact on the identified, locally important heritage assets in the vicinity of the project, and that discussions with the heritage experts at Selby District Council were on-going.

Planning performance agreement

It was confirmed that the Applicant and the host authority had met following the outreach meeting to discuss a planning performance agreement. At the meeting the local authorities confirmed that they would provide a schedule setting out how they planned to work together, including which authority would lead on which issues. The Inspectorate requested that this document be provided to the Examination Authority either as an application document or at the start of the examination.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- The Inspectorate to provide s51 advice regarding the decommissioning EIA baseline.