



## Meeting note

<b>File reference</b>	EN010081
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Karl-Jonas Johansson
<b>Date</b>	21 February 2017
<b>Meeting with</b>	Eggborough Power Limited
<b>Venue</b>	2 Rivergate, Bristol
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>The Planning Inspectorate:</b> Tom Carpen (Infrastructure Planning Lead) - Part Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Kay Sully (Case Manager) Karl-Jonas Johansson (Case Officer) Richard Kent (Senior EIA and Land Advisor)  <b>Eggborough Power Limited</b> James Crankshaw (Eggborough Power Limited) Jason Morris (Eggborough Power Limited) Nick McDonald (Pinsent Masons) Richard Lowe (AECOM) Geoff Bullock (Dalton Warner Davis LLP)
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project update meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	EN010081

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

#### Introduction

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 s51 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). Further to this, it was made clear that any advice given did not constitute legal advice upon which the Applicant (or others) can rely.

Tom Carpen introduced Chris White to the Applicant and his role as the Infrastructure Planning Lead responsible for energy projects.

## **General project update**

The Applicant gave an update on its activities since the last meeting. It was reconfirmed that the draft documents will be submitted to the Inspectorate on Tuesday 14 March 2017.

## **Update on coal-fired power station demolition**

The Applicant confirmed that the decommissioning of the existing coal fired station would be assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES), including cumulative effects but that the timescale for the decommissioning was not clear as the station has a one year extension to produce electricity. The Applicant clarified that the construction and decommissioning traffic would not interact within the site as there are three different access points to the site and the construction and decommissioning traffic will have their own dedicated access points to the site.

The visual impact and the impact on landscape from demolition of the coal fired power station and subsequent construction of the gas fired power stations was discussed. As this is recognised as an issue in the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1), the Applicant was advised to consult EN-1 when compiling its planning statement in regards of significant effects on landscape and visual impact.

## **Gas Pipeline Corridor**

The proposed pipeline's Above Ground Installation (AGI) will be located roughly 3 km north of the site. The pipeline corridor is still being refined and is expected to be no more than approximately 36 m wide, other than where additional areas are required for crossings or compounds. The Applicant advised that negotiations with landowners are progressing with regard to acquiring the necessary land and rights for the AGI site and pipeline corridor. The use of West Lane to access the AGI was discussed and the Applicant advised that the road would not be widened. The Applicant confirmed that it was aware of the proximity of Network Rail assets close to the AGI (the bridge over West Lane) and advised that they are in dialogue with Network Rail regarding its assets and the possible need for protective provisions.

## **Generating capacity**

The Applicant explained the reasoning for the change in capacity from 2000 MW to 2500 MW in more detail following on from discussions at previous meetings. The Applicant was advised to assume that both the peaking plant and the Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) were running at the same time when assessing the worst case scenario for air quality. The Applicant clarified that the gas and electricity connections to the site could not support the coal and the gas powered stations generating electricity at the same time. However there might be an overlap during the construction (not operation, since both cannot operate simultaneously) of the new gas power station. The Applicant was advised to consider whether it needed provision in the DCO to preclude the coal and gas powered stations operating in parallel or to explain in the application documents why such a control is not necessary.

## **Peaking plant and 'black start' plants**

The Applicant explained that the peaking plant might either use Open Cycle Gas Turbine (OCGT) or reciprocating engines. As the reciprocating engines have a bigger

footprint, the maximum number of engines that can fit in the peaking plant building will be addressed in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). The Applicant clarified that the peaking plant would be constrained by limits of deviation in the DCO and that the stack would be a maximum of 45 m in height and the location of it would be fixed. The stack for reciprocating engines would be lower in height.

The background for the need for a 'black start' plant was given. It was clarified that the 'black start' plant would be gas-fired and would have a capacity of circa 30MW. It may be housed within the peaking plant and would use reciprocal diesel engines with a capacity of about 2 MW for start-up. The Applicant clarified that the 'black start' plant is likely to run for about 50 hours a year but will be assessed for 500 hours in the ES.

It was confirmed that the peaking plant is unlikely to be built before the main CCGT plant and that the Applicant does not intend to build the gas powered stations in phases. The Applicant clarified that the peaking plant would not need carbon capture and storage facilities as the carbon capture regulations do not calculate the carbon capture threshold from the site's total output but groups it in types of generating technology. Since the two plants will use different technologies and the peaking plant will be below the threshold for carbon capture, the regulations do not apply in relation to it. The Applicant also advised that carbon capture is not feasible from peaking plants.

### **Environmental Permit**

An application for a variation of the existing permit will be submitted around the same time as the DCO application. The Applicant has begun working on a statement of common ground with the Environment Agency. The Applicant clarified that the emissions from the existing coal power station would be included as part of the baseline conditions with no assumption that the air quality in the area is improving year on year (thus representing a robust worst case). The Applicant further clarified that the permit would assess one of the two options for the scheme (single or multi-shaft layouts as discussed below) as the permit does not allow for flexibility. The Applicant is also reviewing the Hirwaun and Progress Power DCO decisions to see how those two projects dealt with peaking plant controls between the environmental permits and DCOs (it is thought that 1500 hours per annum limit was included within these DCOs). The Applicant was advised to consider a mechanism in the DCO to control the maximum number of hours per year that the peaking plant can run and that this is reflected in the 'worst case' scenario presented in the EIA technical assessments.

### **Deemed Marine License**

The Applicant confirmed that the MMO advised it may not need a deemed marine licence for the horizontal directional drilling (HDD) under the River Aire (for the gas connection to the AGI (but that this was a matter for the Applicant to consider) but that it would need one for the cooling water outfall works. The Applicant is currently proceeding on the basis of including a DML to cover HDD and outfall works.

### **Single and multi-shaft layouts**

The Applicant explained the difference between the two options and clarified that it is including both options in the DCO so as to retain flexibility and so as to be able to

react to guidance (as to the anticipated future energy needs) from National Grid expected around 31 March 2017. It was clarified that the CCGT would either have three single shafts units or one single shaft and one multi-shaft unit. The Applicant has assessed both scenarios and each will be constrained by limits of deviations using the Rochdale envelope approach. The maximum dimensions will be defined in the DCO, although the stack locations and heights will be fixed.

### **Combined Heat and Power**

The Applicant was advised to provide evidence in its Combined Heat and Power (CHP) report why the peaking plant would not be able to contribute to CHP on its own and to explore the possibility as to whether it could feed into a CHP network that got its main heat source from the CCGT plant, to help considerations against the NPS.

### **Draft Document review**

The timescales for the draft documents review was explained and that the review will be followed up by a meeting at Temple Quay House.

The purpose of the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) was discussed. It was clarified that the EM needed to clearly justify the inclusion or exclusion of articles and requirements. The Inspectorate requested that the appendices accompanying the consultation report be included in the review as they are used to cross reference information in the report.

### **Submission of the application**

The application is scheduled to be submitted at the end of May 2017.

The Applicant was advised that it may be useful for them to check through the s55 checklist themselves before submission to ensure all the information provided with the application is clear. They were also encouraged to produce a 'Guide to the Application' along the lines of the one submitted by National Grid for the Richborough Connection and the Hinkley Point C Connection projects. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to treat the guide as a 'live' document during the examination and to use it to signpost when documents had been superseded.

### **AOB**

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate that the Environment Agency has updated its flood risk assessment for the site and now no part of the site is in flood risk zone 3.

It was advised by the Applicant that Historic England has written to confirm that it does not consider that the existing coal-fired power station warrants adding to the statutory list. The Applicant advised, however, that it still intends to submit an application for a Certificate of Immunity from Listing in the near future.

The Applicant's surveys have confirmed that there are no colonies of Great Crested Newts on the site or along the gas pipeline corridor.

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

- The Inspectorate to check that the submission date on the project page is correct.
- The Inspectorate to check the opening hours around the late bank holiday.  
*Post-meeting note – The Inspectorate has confirmed to the Applicant that the application can be submitted on the 30<sup>th</sup> of May 2017.*
- The Applicant to forward its list of venues used for the pre-application consultation to inform the selection of a venue for the preliminary meeting.