

Meeting note

File reference	
Status	FINAL
Author	Kath Dunne
Date	22 July 2016
Meeting with	National Grid
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Attendees	Kath Dunne – Infrastructure Planning Lead (PINS) Mark Wilson - Infrastructure Planning Lead (PINS) Richard Hunt – Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor Richard Gwilliam – National Grid Simon Pepper – National Grid Richard Westwood – National Grid Robert Powell – National Grid Paul Byron – National Grid (NG)
Meeting objectives	
Circulation	All attendees

All parties were familiar with the Planning Inspectorate's statutory duty, under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended (PA 2008), to record the advice that is given in relation to an application or a potential application and to make this publicly available. All parties were also aware that any advice given by the Planning Inspectorate does not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) can rely.

NG explained that since the last meeting with PINS they have been focusing on the design of the proposal. The statutory consultation is due to commence on 8 September 2016.

NG described the scheme. From the proposed Moorside nuclear power station site to Harker substation in the north, a new 400kV overhead line is proposed. Currently two 132kV electric lines are located in a similar area to the proposed 400kV line, NG propose to underground one of the two 132kV lines. A substation is proposed at Stainburn

From the proposed Moorside nuclear power station, south to Heysham, a mixture of standard and lower height towers are proposed for the 400kV



overhead line. NG is considering areas of undergrounding in the southern section, in addition to the tunnel under Morecambe Bay.

NG outlined their materials strategy, highlighting that road and rail delivery options were being considered as part of a multimodal strategy, particularly in light of capacity issues on the A595. NG is particularly focusing on tunnel waste and considering synergies with the Moorside proposal. The tunnel will generate aggregate and some mud marls and NG is considering opportunities to use these on projects e.g. such as Bootle gas works. They are considering use of the Moorside proposed Marine Off -Loading Facility for transportation of their substation transformers.

PINS queried if the T-pylon had been considered for this proposal and encouraged NG to request comments from Ofgem on this. NG explained that T-pylons were referenced in their earlier rounds of consultation and the responses did not indicate that the consultees had preferred these to the conventional lattice towers. NG further explained that they consider the lattice towers to be better suited to this landscape.

PINS queried how close the proposal will run to the existing Sellafield site and as a result, could this lead to any national security issues? PINS encouraged NG to clarify whether any issues of this nature exist and strongly urged that the developer seek a negotiated position to avoid the need for national security matters to be dealt with during the examination.

NG has issued a further draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to the relevant local authorities for their comment. A previous version had been issued, however since the delay to the consultation, NG decided to consult again on this document.

NG explained that they are providing certain documents to the Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) local authorities, Natural England, Environment Agency and the Lake District National Park Authority ahead of consultation. PINS queried if this information could be placed on NGs website for all consultees to review. NG explained that they had decided to send it to the above consultees because they will be commenting on the whole of the proposed route, as opposed to specific sections of the route and that the documents were being provided only to enable these bodies to plan their resources, and not for the receipt of comments. In addition, NG explained that they are still finalising their route for consultation and that they would wish to liaise with individual landowners prior to issuing route information into the public domain.

PINS advised NG that it may be helpful to also engage directly with local schools, residential homes and churches etc when undertaking consultation, as this approach can highlight any key issues prior to the



examination. This should be viewed as an evidence gathering exercise for the benefit of the wider project.

NG and PINS discussed recent correspondence submitted by Stewart Bradshaw and Graham Barron regarding the consultation.

NG confirmed that they have already responded to Stewart Bradshaw's correspondence and they will send PINS a copy of this response. Both parties discussed the points raised in the letter, including:

- The Duddon Estuary and options for the route in this area and the HVDC south option.
- A request for a joint meeting with National Grid and the local community (it is noted that Ofgem and PINS are also invited to the meeting)
- A request for full disclosure of financial and technical evidence as part of the consultation
- The duration of the proposed consultation
- The release of early consultation information to the PPA local authorities.

NG confirmed that it will provide the financial and technical information within their consultation and that it is considering / finalising the draft route at the Duddon Estuary, prior to consultation. It will indicate where information can be found regarding the studies undertaken on the HVDC route options. They are considering the length of the proposed consultation in light of the more recent SoCC consultation responses from the local authorities and as referred to above, NG consider that it is the appropriate course of action to release some consultation documents early to certain consultees at this stage.

Both parties discussed the points raised in Graham Barron's letter (from Power Without Pylons), including:

- The offshore south, and onshore south with tunnel options and the selection of the preferred route.
- Query as to why a tunnel option for the Duddon Estuary has not been pursued
- Concerns regarding NGs adequate consideration of alternatives
- Request that PINS asks NG to supply full evidence off both costs and technical feasibility for the alternative route options to be provided as soon as possible.

NG confirmed that the above information regarding the consideration of alternatives, including the costs and technical feasibility will be available during the statutory consultation, and that some of this information is already publically available in the Statement of Preferred Route Corridor.

The applicant provided an update regarding the preparation of Environmental Impact Assessment and Preliminary Environmental Information. NG discussed the potential for residual significant effects to arise in relation to landscape and visual effects, heritage effects relating to



listed buildings, traffic (subject to the selected strategy), ecology, socioeconomic effects, wastes/materials. The Appropriate Assessment was discussed including the potential stages of assessment likely to be required. PINS advised the applicant that they may wish to consider consulting with the Northern Ireland government regarding the potential for effects on marine mammals arising from the tunnel islet creation. Relevant contacts can be found at

http://www.unece.org/env/eia/focalpoints.html

NG discussed landscape mitigation and highlighted that landscaping proposals would clearly show the distinction between planting measures that were considered to be essential mitigation and further potential offsite planting that would be subject to agreement with landowners.

The applicant highlighted that discussions were ongoing with Natural England and the Environment Agency regarding consents and licences and that neither Natural England or the Environment Agency wish to have these wrapped up in the DCO.

The Planning Inspectorate indicated that a site visit would be useful to understand the scheme context. All to consider best date to visit the site.