



Preliminary Meeting Note

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Application: | Cory Decarbonisation Project |
| Reference: | EN010128 |
| Time and date: | 10:00 am, 5 November 2024 |
| Venue: | Delta Hotels Bexleyheath and online via Microsoft Teams |

This meeting note is not a full transcript of the Preliminary Meeting. It is a summary of the key points discussed.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Mr Geoff Underwood, welcomed those present and introduced himself as the single appointed person and Examining Authority (ExA) to examine the Cory Decarbonisation Project application.

The ExA explained that he would be examining the application made by Cory Environmental Holdings Limited (CEHL ('the Applicant')) before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State who will decide whether an Order granting Development Consent for the proposed project, which is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), should be made.

The ExA explained the purpose of the Preliminary Meeting (PM) and noted that the Examination will commence after the PM closes.

The ExA confirmed that all documents and submissions received and accepted during the Examination will be published on the project-specific page of the National Infrastructure Planning [website](#).

2. Video recording

The video recording of this Preliminary Meeting is available on the National Infrastructure Planning website and can be accessed [here](#).

3. Privacy and data protection

The ExA reminded participants that the meeting was being livestreamed and recorded. He reminded attendees of the information provided in the Rule 6 letter of 7 October 2024 including a link to the Planning Inspectorate's [Privacy Notice](#).

4. Examination Process

The ExA briefly explained the examination process under the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008).

further info can be found:

[Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: What to expect at a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project event - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-what-to-expect-at-a-nationally-significant-infrastructure-project-event)

[Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Registering to speak at, or attend, a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project event - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-registering-to-speak-at-or-attend-a-nationally-significant-infrastructure-project-event)

Ridgeway Users raised a point about the ability of Romani communities to participate fairly in the Examination process and the ExA encouraged Ridgeway Users to provide details in writing for consideration.

5. Procedural decisions

The ExA referred to the procedural decisions made under section 89(3) of the PA2008 and asked for any observations.

Procedural decisions can be found in [Annex F](#) of the Rule 6 Letter.

The Applicant noted that they would continue to endeavor to enter into Statements of Common Ground with all parties identified but noted that was dependent on those parties wishing to do so.

Thames Water made points about access to the secure part of Crossness Nature Reserve and their emergency access as part of any Accompanied Site Inspection.

6. Initial Assessment of Principal Issues

The ExA explained the purpose of the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues (section 88 of the PA2008), which can be found in [Annex B](#) of the Rule 6 letter and asked for any observations on them.

Landsul Ltd and Munster Joinery (UK) Ltd observed that although covered by other points, it may be of value to identify the land requirement for the proposal in light of the anticipated scheme design as a separate issue.

Ridgeway Users made observations about accessibility to grazing marsh land including that on the site by the Romani community.

7. Examination Timetable

The ExA noted comments already received in writing relating to the draft Examination Timetable contained in [Annex C](#) of Rule 6 letter and also welcomed further suggestions from the parties in attendance.

The Applicant noted the route taken by the ExA on an Unaccompanied Site Inspection and observed that it might be preferable for Interested Parties in the first instance to

identify locations for the ExA to visit, for the Applicant to consider, noting that some land is not in their control.

Save Crossness Nature Reserve noted that they will suggest locations but that they would prefer to respond to the Applicant's draft itinerary. Thames water would want to comment on any suggested itinerary.

Ridgeway Users noted issues of accessibility and engagement in respect of the Romani community.

Landsul Ltd and Munster Joinery (UK) Ltd noted their intention to provide detailed expert evidence on scheme design and implications for site extent and configuration for Carbon Capture Facility. They expect their objection to be heard at a subsequent Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH2) and would hope to cross-examine the Appellant's witness on the matter. They expected to submit it at Deadline 1, for the Applicant to respond at Deadline 2 and that both parties' experts provide a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) at Deadline 3. They encouraged the Applicant to provide any details of any alterations to proposed work packages as early as possible to enable them to take it into consideration. Further that Deadline 3 would be the deadline for an application for cross-examination of witnesses to be made.

The Applicant advised that they would aim to provide information of any change to work packages by the 18 November and to send directly to Landsul Ltd and Munster Joinery (UK) Ltd at the same time as the Planning Inspectorate (see item 8 below). They requested that any application for cross-examination should be clearly focused in terms of subject, assisted by a SoCG. If there were not to be a mutual statement on cross examination they would like to respond by 24 January.

The Applicant requested that setting a deadline for their response to Landsul Ltd and Munster Joinery (UK) Ltd a week after Deadline 2 would be helpful.

Western Riverside Waste Authority made a point about ensuring sufficient time at CAH2 and the Applicant indicated their willingness to co-operate should CAH2 extend to more than one day.

All comments received were duly noted by the ExA and considerations will be reflected in the Rule 8 Letter which will contain the final Examination timetable.

8. Other issues

The Applicant advised that they intended to table an alteration to the description of the Works to give more flexibility in respect of cooling equipment identified in the draft Development Consent Order as part of Work package 1E which they intend would also be referred to under Work package 1A.

The Preliminary Meeting concluded at 11:45 am