



Meeting note

File reference	N/A
Status	Final
Author	Siân Evans
Date	16 October 2017
Meeting with	SSE
Venue	Temple Quay House
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Tracey Williams (Case Manager) Siân Evans (Case Officer) Hannah Pratt (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor) SSE Geoff Bullock (Dalton Warner Davis LLP) Jim Lawrie (SSE) Richard Lowe (AECOM)
Meeting objectives	Introduction to the Ferrybridge 'D' CCGT Project
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

Introduction

SSE (the Applicant) and the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) case team introduced themselves and their respective roles. The Inspectorate outlined 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. It was clarified to the Applicant that the publication of the meeting note could be delayed up to six months or until a formal scoping request had been submitted, if the project information was regarded commercially sensitive by the Applicant.

Proposed development

The Applicant gave a brief overview and history of the Ferrybridge site which included identification of the operational Ferrybridge Multifuel 1 (FM1) power station and the Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) power station which is currently under construction. The proposal for Ferrybridge 'D' is for a new 1.8 GW Combined Cycle Gas Turbine

generating station to replace the coal station (Ferrybridge 'C') which closed in March 2016 and which will be demolished by 2021.

The Applicant advised that the site has good transport links and a good connection to the national grid. There are no internationally designated ecological sites in the immediate vicinity of the Ferrybridge site but there are a couple of Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 15km.

The Applicant is currently considering two options for the site of the generating station: (i) on the Ferrybridge 'C' site; and (ii) on the existing coal yard site. Both options are within the land ownership of the Applicant. The Applicant confirmed that a preferred site will be selected prior to preliminary environmental information (PEI) being issued. Up to four of the existing eight cooling towers from Ferrybridge 'C' could be re-used.

The generating station would require a grid connection to an existing substation within the Ferrybridge site and some works would be necessary to replace infrastructure at the substation. The type of grid connection (i.e. overground or underground) would depend on the siting of the generation station.

The Applicant has undertaken an initial feasibility study for the gas connection route. Three routes have been examined (Northern – approx. 8.5km, Central – approx. 9.5km Southern). The Southern route has been discounted as it crosses a congested area and is located inside the flood defences of the River Aire. The Northern and Central routes are still under consideration. Both would connect to Feeder 29 of the National Transmission System. A preferred route will be selected prior to PEI being issued. Either option of the pipeline would cross the River Aire (which is a non-tidal main river) and a number of roads. The Central route would require two rail crossings. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to engage early with Network Rail and start negotiations on any protective provisions.

The Applicant advised that there are approximately 20 landowners along either gas connection route. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to engage with landowners, consider any adverse effects on farming practices (such as drainage and sterilisation of land) and undertake early engagement with the National Farmers' Union.

The Applicant advised that there is an existing water abstraction licence that they can use although this may be varied to reduce the capacity. The existing discharge permit may also be varied. The Applicant confirmed it would likely require an environmental permit for construction works in the river.

The Applicant enquired on the use of compulsory acquisition (CA) powers. The Inspectorate advised that CA should only be used as a last resort and therefore the Applicant should start negotiations with landowners. There is a risk to delivery of the project if CA is not included in the Development Consent Order.

The Applicant advised that they propose to submit a scoping report to the Inspectorate in late 2017. This will include both options for the siting of the generating station and two gas pipeline route options. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to send a GIS shapefile at least 10 working days before submission of the scoping report.

The Applicant is proposing to start informal, non-statutory consultation late Q1 2018. Statutory consultation is proposed for late Q2/ early Q3 2018. The Applicant anticipates submission of the application early Q1 2019 to enable access to the 2021 capacity market auction.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

The Applicant to confirm the name of the project.

The Inspectorate to send the new case information proforma to the Applicant to enable registration on the website.