



## Meeting note

<b>File reference</b>	Keuper Underground Gas Storage
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Steven Parker
<b>Date</b>	27 January 2014
<b>Meeting with</b>	Keuper Gas Storage Ltd
<b>Venue</b>	Temple Quay House
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>The Planning Inspectorate</b> Tom Carpen Frances Russell Lynne Franklin Steven Parker  <b>Keuper Gas Storage Ltd</b> Richard Stevenson, INEOS Enterprises Ltd Kevin Murphy, ERM Amy Hopkinson, PPS Paul Zyda, Zyda Law Liz McCartney, Zyda Law
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	For the applicant to outline their approach to the planning inspectorate
<b>Circulation</b>	All Attendees

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

#### Introduction

The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) outlined its openness policy and ensured the applicant understood that any issues discussed and advice given would be recorded and placed on the Planning Inspectorate's website under s.51 of the Planning Act 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.

#### Overview

Keuper Gas Storage Ltd is proposing an underground gas storage facility with a capacity of 500 Million Cubic Metres (MCM) and a flow rate of 34 MCM per day. The draft application site extends to approx. 400 HA with the main development area being 2km west of Byley village in Cheshire; part of the draft application site is currently used for solution mining brine and on and under nearby land are two underground gas storage facilities, operated by two companies.

## **Solution Mining**

Solution mining is proposed to create the caverns to be used to store gas. The brine would be carried from the site via an existing pipeline to a facility in Runcorn. It is envisaged that an existing pump house would need to be re-commissioned; there would be no changes to the building but it would need to be re-roofed.

The applicant advised that extant permits allow for 45mm<sup>3</sup> of water to be abstracted and for excess brine to be discharged into the Weston/Runcorn canal and Manchester Ship Canal. Discussions with the Environment Agency will be undertaken to confirm that these permits are sufficient and valid for use with the proposed development.

## **Gas Storage**

The storage facility would consist of up to 19 caverns. There is an existing connection to the gas national transmission system (NTS) and to assist gas cycling operations two gas marshalling compounds would be required.

The applicant advised that it is proposing a new Gas Processing Plant which will require an electrical supply connection from Manweb, necessitating additional electrical supply infrastructure.

## **Geology**

Seismic surveys have been carried out, and the applicant advised that there are no known faults within the proposed application site.

The applicant advised that the construction program would last 9 years, with up to 8 caverns developed at a time, with each cavern taking approximately 2 years to mine. It is intended that the storage facility would have a life span of 50 years.

PINS advised the applicant to have regard to the National Policy Statement with respect to Geology, in particular paragraph 2.8.9 and to consider the relevance of capacity in relation to the suitability of the proposal.

## **Scoping request**

The applicant intends to submit a scoping request to the Planning Inspectorate before the end of February 2014.

In answer to a question about the use of consultants, PINS advised the applicant that the request would be reviewed in-house but that consultants would be brought in if required. PINS advised that it does not review Environmental Statements prior to submission. PINS advised that all responses to the scoping request would be published as part of the report.

## **Consultation**

The applicant was advised that it may wish to undertake non-statutory consultation with Local Authorities, Members of Parliament Parish Councils and Wards.

PINS also advised that if it received correspondence from individuals at pre-application it would normally advise them to contact the applicant directly and the local authority if it raised a matter about the adequacy of consultation.

The applicant asked whether the approach they had taken with regard to consultation zones was suitable, and what approach would the Inspectorate prefer to see. PINS advised that it is for the applicant to determine, taking account of comments from the local authorities on the draft SoCC as they are in the best position to advise on what's appropriate. PINS advised that the applicant may wish to have regard to Parish Councils outside of the zone and to retain flexibility so that it could respond to requests for information or additional consultation.

### **Draft documents and outreach**

The applicant proposed to submit their draft documents for review in December 2014. PINS advised that it can take between 4 and 6 weeks for the first review of documents depending on what was submitted, and that it could look at further iterations following that.

The applicant informed PINS that the Local Authorities in the area may have limited experience of the infrastructure planning regime. PINS advised that if the local authorities would find it helpful, PINS could attend a meeting to outline the process. Following consultation, PINS could also hold a further meeting to see if there were any outstanding issues and to advise on the process around examination.

### **Compulsory Acquisition**

PINS asked whether the redline boundary included the whole length of the pipeline and if land consents would be required. The applicant advised that land consents under S.52 & s.53 of the Planning Act 2008 were not anticipated.

The applicant advised that it was seeking to acquire additional land via private treaty but that if this were not possible they would be seeking to acquire them through compulsory acquisition powers as part of the development consent order. The applicant confirmed that it did not anticipate the need for replacement land.

PINS advised that it would be best for certificates to be complete before submission, as otherwise this issue could become an issue for examination.

The applicant asked how PINS would treat confidential or commercially sensitive documents. PINS advised that at pre-application, the best approach was to consider if the Inspectorate needed to see such documents. While there was no requirement to publish these documents, they would still be subject to requests, under the Freedom of Information Act. PINS advised that it didn't see the need for any such information at this stage.

PINS advised the applicant to start to consider preparing statements of common ground in discussion with any parties the applicant considered relevant, possibly including Local Authorities, the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive.

PINS gave advice on the role of the Consents Service Unit. PINS advised that the CSU could support applicants by considering how progress on and issues arising from non-DCO consents could impact on the examination of the proposed application. PINS recommended the applicant contacted CSU given the nature of the proposal.

### **Timescales**

The applicant advised of the following proposed timescales

Scoping Request – February 2014  
Statement of Community Consultation – September 2014  
Formal Consultation – September 2014  
Draft documents – December 2014  
Development Consent Order Application – January 2015

**Specific decisions / follow up required?**

- Applicant to contact with the Consents Service Unit at the Planning Inspectorate.
- Possible PINS site visit and meeting with local authorities prior to consultation.
- Possible meeting between applicant, PINS, the Local Authorities and Statutory Consultees following the end of the Statutory Consultation period, to identify outstanding issues and advise on process.
- Monthly teleconference to receive project updates, to be agreed.