



Meeting note

File reference	EN010086
Status	Final
Author	Karl-Jonas Johansson
Date	21 April 2016
Meeting with	Wyre Power Ltd
Venue	The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, Bristol
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate: Tom Carpen (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Helen Lancaster (Senior EIA advisor) Karl-Jonas Johansson (Case Officer) Wyre Power Ltd Arran Cameron (Wyre Power Ltd) Wendy Hogben (RSK Environment Ltd)
Meeting objectives	Introduction of the Fleetwood CCGT Project (Post meeting note: now called Hillhouse Enterprise Zone Power Station or Hillhouse EZPS)
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

Introduction

The project team 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. It was clarified to the applicant that the publication of the initial meeting note could be delayed up to six months if the project information was regarded commercially sensitive by the applicant.

Project details

The project is for a gas fired generating station located on a plot of land owned by the applicant at the Hillhouse International Business Park in Thornton-Cleveleys near Fleetwood. The NPL group of companies acquired Wyre Power the company that previously applied for a generation station consent under s.36 of the 1989 Electricity Act at the same site and associated 11km gas pipeline under a Pipeline Construction

Authorisation in 1998, 2009 and 2010. The applicant advised that it intends to use the relevant prepared materials and feedback obtained where possible to assist in this Development Consent Order (DCO) application. The project will include new AGI's at St Michael's on Wyre and Hillhouse and an electrical cable to Stannah substation. (Please see the section on electricity and gas connections for further information)

The applicant confirmed that it has secured funding for the new project. The applicant was advised to consult the White Rose Carbon Capture and Storage decision letter for guidance on what the Secretary of State deems is necessary to include in the funding statement.

Summary of potential issues

The applicant outlined its early consideration of potential issues for the project.

Visual impact

Due to the site being located centre of the business park, the site is therefore already well screened. The applicant explained how the surrounding area had evolved in terms of new developments, however, the applicant considers that at this stage visual impact is not likely to be a significant issue for the project.

Noise

The applicant informed the Inspectorate that during the previous application noise had been identified as a potential issue but stated that it would do new noise studies and mitigation to minimise the impact of noise on the surrounding area. These new studies would take into account the new housing developments built in the surrounding area.

Contaminated land

The site was previously used by ICI for producing chemicals and is known to have levels of contamination. The applicant is intending to prepare a detailed study to establish and mitigate any risks to ground water and the Wyre estuary. The applicant further stated that due to the site being contaminated some rare species of plants and insects has colonised the site which might need a mitigation plan.

Electricity and gas connections

The generation station will be connected to the grid at Stanah substation which is approximately 1 km from the site. The applicant confirmed that no overhead lines would be necessary.

The gas supplies will be provided from the national transmission system (NTS) at St Michael's on Wyre which is approximately 11 km from the site. The applicant confirmed that a new above ground installation will be necessary to accommodate the connection of the new pipeline to the existing NTS.

The applicant further explained that it intended to make use of horizontal directional drilling techniques to drill the gas pipeline under the Wyre estuary, which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, to minimise the impact on the site.

Ecology

The applicant informed the Inspectorate that during recent surveys of the pipeline corridor, presence of great crested newts had been identified. The Inspectorate advised that a draft European Protective Species permit application relating to the great crested newts should be submitted in parallel with the application.

Flood risk

The site is in Flood Risk Zone 3 but there are already flood defences in place.

Traffic and transport

It was further confirmed that the road access to the site was good but that there might be some need for additional road infrastructure to accommodate the building of the gas pipeline. The applicant explained that the traffic modelling done for the site didn't predict that the additional traffic would cause an issue but stated that it was of concern to the locals.

Land access and rights

The Inspectorate asked whether applicant would be seeking compulsory acquisition powers in the DCO, and / or whether it intended to apply for access to land under s.53 of PA 2008.

The applicant has subsequently advised that the DCO will include compulsory acquisition powers, but their preferred approach is to achieve land assembly via private negotiation and acquisition. They are not anticipating the need for an application under s53 of PA2008.

Carbon capture

As the generating station is above the 300MW threshold the applicant was advised to consult the National Policy Statements (NPS) for energy to ensure they fulfil the Carbon Capture Readiness obligation set out in the NPSs.

Combined Heat and Power

The applicant was further advised that the NPS for energy require them to assess if the station can provide Combined Heat and Power (CHP) to the surrounding area. If the CHP assessment concludes that it is not possible to provide CHP or that there are no suitable end users of CHP, this needs to be justified in the application's CHP report.

Environmental Statement

The applicant informed the Inspectorate that it would be producing an Environmental Statement and intended to divide the Environmental Statement (ES) into two parts.

Part one would cover the generating station and part two the pipeline. The ES would be based on the previous applications. The applicant stated that it intended to undertake new baseline surveys for ecology, noise, traffic, air quality studies and landscape and visual studies.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) timescales

The Inspectorate advised the applicant that the EIA scoping report needed to be substantial enough for the consultees to be able to understand the impact the project would have on the site. The applicant was further advised not to refer consultees to documents published elsewhere but to provide all consultees with a full suite of consultation documents.

The Inspectorate informed the applicant that only one shapefile should be submitted and that using the pipeline corridor rather than the exact pipeline route was acceptable. The applicant was advised to submit the shapefile ten working days prior to the scoping request.

Consultation timescales

The applicant explained that it was intending to use the previously prepared consultation material when possible but was aware of that the requirement for consultation under PA 2008 is different from previous consenting regime. The applicant stated that they intend to work closely with Wyre Borough Council and Lancashire County Council when finalising the consultation strategy. The Inspectorate stressed the importance of ensuring that all relevant consultees had been consulted with and to keep a record of all formal and informal consultation conducted.

The Inspectorate advise the applicant of the importance of allowing all consultees enough time to both digest the project information and time to respond. The applicant was further advised to clearly show in its consultation report how it had had regards to all relevant consultation responses and to clearly justify why certain suggestions had been rejected.

The applicant was advised to work closely with the local authorities on the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) before submitting it for formal 28 day consultation to ensure that it was robust. If requested, the Inspectorate can review the SoCC before the formal consultation.

The applicant informed the Inspectorate that it intended to use the previous applications consultation matrix as a base for its s42 consultation. The applicant is intending to only do one round of consultation. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that under certain circumstances it could facilitate tri-partite meetings to help resolve issues before the submission of the application.

Post Meeting Note The applicant has agreed to 2 rounds of consultation, but only one of which is to be formal pursuant to S42.

The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it has to provide a Preliminary Environmental Impact Report under regulation 10 of the EIA regulations and that it needs to contain enough information for the consultees to understand the projects potential impacts on the environment.

Permits

The applicant was advised the Environmental Permit (EP) needed for the generating station could either be sought in parallel with the DCO application or after consent has

been granted. It was further advised that the NPS for energy contains guidance on when to apply for an EP.

The applicant queried the required status of grid offer in the application and the Inspectorate confirmed that an offer needed to be in place and highlighted in a grid connection statement.

Intended submission date

The applicant indicated that it was aiming to submit the application to the inspectorate at the end of quarter 4 2016. Following further consideration the applicant subsequently advised post meeting it intended to submit its application in Q2/Q3 2017. The applicant stated that it thought this was feasible as it had the previous application material to base its new application on.

The Inspectorate highlighted that the DCO application differs from a Town and Country Act planning application and therefore the wording of the Order needs to be clear and all articles and requirements need to be justifiable. It was further advised that arrangements outside the scope of the DCO could be agreed by Statements of Common Ground.

The applicant was advised that the size of the panel which would constitute the Examining Authority could only be determined after the application had been accepted for examination and the issues from the relevant representations have been analysed. The applicant was further advised that complex issues such as compulsory acquisition of land could lead to the appointment of a panel.

The applicant was advised that the Inspectorate can review parts of the application documents before the submission and that it could take between 3 weeks – 3 months depending on how many iterations of the application documents the applicant thought necessary. The applicant was informed that the Inspectorate can review the DCO, the Explanatory Memorandum, the Habitats Regulation Assessment, Funding Statement, Statement of Reason and the plans. Any advice given on the draft documents will be published on the Inspectorate's project page but not the draft documents.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- The Inspectorate to advise the applicant how to contact the Consents Service Unit.
- Contact plan with monthly / quarterly meetings to be agreed between the applicant and the Inspectorate