



Meeting note

Project Name	Wheelabrator Harewood Waste-to-Energy Facility
File reference	EN010104
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	09 July 2018
Meeting with	Wheelabrator Technologies Inc.
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Meeting objectives	Introduction to Wheelabrator Harewood Waste-to-Energy Project
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed, and advice given:

Introduction

Wheelabrator (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 of the project, which is proposed for a site owned by Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Limited, north of the village of Barton Stacey in Hampshire. The proposed development is for a two-line phased build waste-to-energy plant with a combined output estimated at up to circa 65MW gross). The predicted fuel throughput is estimated at 600,000 tonnes per annum. The Applicant advised that the plant will be Combined Heat and Power enabled and are currently looking at options although they recognise that these are limited in this rural location.

The Applicant advised that the Raymond Brown site has been allocated as a strategic waste site within the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and is subject to a safeguarding buffer. The site has good access off the A303, is located away from residential areas and there are no internationally designated nature conservation sites within 10km. There is Ministry of Defence (MOD) land in the area and a clay pigeon shooting range to the east of the site. To the north of the site is a solar array farm.

The Applicant advised that they consider there will be minimal impact on the operations of the MOD, the shooting range or the solar farm.

The Applicant stated that they had identified a site 7km from their proposed development for connection to the national grid via a 132kV overhead line. The Applicant advised that they do not propose to include this within their application as this can be progressed by a Distribution Network Operator. The Inspectorate advised that this could be included as associated development. The Applicant confirmed that they would include the grid connection within the cumulative impact assessment of the Environmental Statement (ES).

The Applicant advised that they will be seeking some flexibility in the location of the emission stacks. The Inspectorate advised that [Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope](#) has recently been updated. The Inspectorate also advised that [Advice Note 15: Drafting Development Consent Orders](#) has also been updated which are particularly relevant in relation to justifying flexibility. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to ensure that there is consistency between the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and the ES. The Explanatory Memorandum should explain and justify why flexibility is being sought in the DCO.

The Applicant advised that they do not consider there to be any land they will need to compulsorily acquire at this stage. The Inspectorate remarked that applicants sometimes apply for compulsory acquisition on a precautionary basis in case there are unknown/ unexpected owners or rights over land.

The Applicant advised that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) is not expected to be required. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider whether any traffic impacts will affect any European Sites and therefore trigger HRA. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant of the recent Judgement (People over Wind & Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta) that states that mitigation should not be included at the screening stage of any HRA.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consult Highways England about their proposals early on.

Timetable

The Applicant is currently preparing their Statement of Community Consultation which they will send to Hampshire County Council and Test Valley Borough Council. As these local authorities may not have dealt with a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project before the Inspectorate advised that the Applicant could point the local authorities to [Advice Note two: The role of local authorities in the development consent process](#) and the short [accompanying video](#).

The Applicant advised that they propose to start non-statutory consultation in February 2019.

The Applicant proposes to submit their scoping request to the Inspectorate in February 2019. The Applicant does not consider this to cause a problem with their non-statutory consultation taking place at the same time as statutory consultees are not included in the non-statutory consultation, which will be more focused on the local community.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to clearly justify why any topics should be scoped out of the ES. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to look at [Advice Note seven: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements](#). The Inspectorate advised that the GIS shapefile should be submitted to the Inspectorate at least 10 days before the scoping request.

The Applicant advised that they intend to start their statutory consultation in Q3 2019 and submit the application to the Inspectorate in late Q4 2019. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that draft documents can be submitted for review. The Inspectorate advised that this can take 6-8 weeks and the Applicant should allow sufficient time in their programme to take any comments into account in their final submission.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

Site visit to be arranged prior to scoping request.