



Meeting note

File reference	EN070001 – Yorkshire and Humber CCS Cross Country Pipeline
Status	Final
Author	Patrycja Pikniczka
Date	13 February 2013
Meeting with	National Grid
Venue	Temple Quay House Bristol BS1 6PN
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Iwan Davies – Case Lead Patrycja Pikniczka – Case Officer Steven Parker – Assistant Case Officer Nicola Mathiason – Lawyer David Price – EIA & Land Rights Manager Hannah Pratt - EIA & Land Rights Advisor Consent Service Unit (CSU) John Gordon David Watts Applicant Richard Gwilliam - National Grid Will Bridges - National Grid Liz Wells - National Grid (WYG) Giles Pink - BLP Law Charlotte Clinton – Aecom (via telecom)
Meeting objectives	Meeting to discuss draft documents submitted by the applicant in January 2014.
Circulation	All attendees

The applicant was advised of the Planning Inspectorate's openness policy and that any advice given will be recorded and placed on the planning portal website under s51 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by Localism Act 2011) (PA 2008) and that any advice given does not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) can rely. The comments within this note are therefore without prejudice to any matters that may be considered at the acceptance or examination stages.

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

Overall Project Update

Following introductions, National Grid (NG) delivered a short presentation on the project. The presentation can be accessed [here](#).

The applicant explained that the project forms part of a wider scheme comprising four main elements:

- i. White Rose CCS Power Station (separate application under the Planning Act 2008);
- ii. onshore CCS cross country pipeline (this project);
- iii. offshore pipeline approximately 90km in length by National Grid; and
- iv. offshore CO₂ storage under the seabed by National Grid.

Both offshore elements will be determined by the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) under the Petroleum Act 1998 and the Energy Act 2008. The applicant confirmed that there is an existing agreement in place with the Crown Estate for the storage site.

The applicant explained that together the proposed White Rose CCS Power Station and the National Grid constituent elements would act as a full scale CCS demonstration project and that emissions from the White Rose project are to be the initial source of carbon dioxide (CO₂) for the proposed Yorkshire and Humber CCS cross country pipeline ('CCS pipeline').

The White Rose project will comprise an oxyfuel combustion capture plant which will burn coal as the principal fuel in oxygen mixed with recycled fuel gas. The CO₂ will be captured and compressed into a liquid for transportation through the CCS pipeline to a storage site beneath the North Sea. It was further explained that National Grid's proposed CCS pipeline and storage facilities will also be able to transport and store carbon dioxide from other regional emitters overtime and hence a 'multi-junction,' which is a facility to allow multiple pipelines to connect, forms part of project proposals.

The applicant advised that the length of the main pipeline is approximately 68km from the multi-junction to the pumping station; together with associated interconnecting local pipelines a total length of approximately 75km. The project comprises other associated infrastructure including six Above Ground Installations (AGIs) including Pipeline Internal/Inspection Gauge (PIG) traps, a 'multi-junction', three block valves and a pumping station.

The applicant advised that the proposed White Rose project will produce 2.6 million tonnes (MT) of CO₂ per year. The CCS pipeline will have a capacity to transport 17m tonnes of CO₂ annually. The Development Consent Order (DCO) application project

boundary will run from an inlet pipe at the proposed White Rose project to a pumping station in Barmston and beyond to the mean low water mark.

The applicant advised that the anticipated submission date is Q2 2014.

Consultation

The Planning Inspectorate advised the applicant of its general comments on the draft Consultation Report submitted in January 2014. Final comments were provided to the applicant following the meeting and are available to view [here](#).

The applicant explained that an alternative location for the pumping station is being considered as a result of feedback received during the stage 2 statutory consultation and therefore the decision was made to undertake further consultation (stage 2A). The applicant confirmed that stage 2A consultation started on 12 February 2014 and will end in mid March 2014. The applicant explained that section 42 (s42) stakeholder groups, affected landowners under s44 and the affected community (under s47) were notified about this further consultation and provided with at least of 28 days for responses. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to ensure justification is provided within the Consultation Report why the stage 2A consultation did not constitute a full re-consultation.

The applicant was advised that original responses to the application can be requested from the applicant at the application stage in accordance with Regulation 5(5) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. It is not the aim to request the responses for each project, but if there are any uncertainties or lack of clarity in relation to consultation then this is the only power that can be used at this stage to request such evidence. The applicant was also encouraged to have a clear understanding of local authorities' submissions on the adequacy of consultation prior to the Acceptance stage and to resolve any outstanding matters now.

Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) & Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

The Inspectorate had previously provided s51 advice in relation to the applicant's draft HRA report. This advice is available to view [here](#). The Inspectorate advised the applicant to ensure the project description in the Environmental Statement (ES) is consistent with that in the DCO.

The applicant asked for clarification from the Inspectorate regarding their approach to the assessment of in-combination effects where a likely significant effect is already avoided. The Inspectorate advised that it is essential for the applicant to demonstrate that they have considered the potential for in-combination impacts to occur where avoidance is not possible.

The Inspectorate noted that the applicant's draft HRA screening matrices were broken down into separate stages and advised the applicant to also submit summary matrices that are produced in accordance with the templates appended to Advice Note 10. The Inspectorate explained that this will assist the Examining Authority (ExA) in drafting

the Report on Impacts on European Sites (RIES), should one be needed for the project. The Inspectorate explained that once produced, the report will be subject to consultation. The ExA incorporates a deadline for receipt of comments on RIES within its final examination timetable.

The applicant confirmed that the development proposed near and at the foreshore has been considered but screened out as there is no potential to result in a likely significant effect on the Humber Estuary SAC European Site from works at the foreshore. The Inspectorate enquired whether there was an agreed approach to the mitigation of impacts upon this site in order to avoid a significant effect. The applicant confirmed that Natural England has requested further information to be provided within the HRA Report justifying the applicant's conclusion of no likely significant effect. The applicant confirmed that there are on-going discussions with Natural England to agree the level of information required. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to be specific in their ES when explaining advice received from the Marine Management Organisation (MMO).

The Inspectorate advised that mitigation measures relied upon in the ES should be tabulated and cross referenced to relevant requirements in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). This would provide an easy point of reference demonstrating that the mitigation is secured within the DCO.

The Inspectorate agreed to review the chapter of the applicant's ES that explains how the EIA will assess both a worst case scenario and a realistic case scenario for the pipeline routeing.

The applicant advised that the ES for the offshore pipeline project (not considered under the Planning Act 2008) should be drafted by the end of 2014 and in preparation for any hearings that may be held during the Yorkshire and Humber Pipeline examination, should the application reach this stage.

Draft Development Consent Order (DCO), Explanatory Memorandum (EM) and Plans
The Planning Inspectorate advised the applicant of its comments on the draft DCO, EM and plans submitted in January 2014. These comments are available to view [here](#).

The Inspectorate urged the applicant to ensure that any outstanding matters or issues that local authorities, statutory parties and others have with the application should be resolved prior to submission.

The applicant explained that there are currently on-going discussions with relevant local planning authorities (LPAs) and the MMO in relation to discharging DCO requirements.

The Inspectorate advised the applicant to be clear about the powers it is seeking in its DCO. The applicant was advised to ensure that the definition of 'maintain' in the DCO is clearly defined.

The applicant confirmed that it would be seeking powers of compulsory acquisition for rights to be acquired in certain parts of the application site.

The Inspectorate advised the applicant to ensure that the project description within the DCO and EM is clear for everyone to understand. The applicant advised that the Rochdale Envelope approach will be used for the scheme and certain drawings and models are indicative. The Inspectorate advised for the maximum dimensions of all indicative drawings to be clearly explained within the DCO and ES.

The Planning Inspectorate advised the applicant to ensure that each plot of land is separately labelled on the plan. The plots of land on plans should be accurately referred to within the Book of Reference. The works labelled on the plans should match the description within the DCO. The applicant agreed to consider these comments and amend the plans as appropriate. The Planning Inspectorate agreed to review further draft plans once the amendments have been made.

The applicant was advised to ensure that plans referred to the correct Regulations of the 'Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures Regulations 2009 (as amended)(APFP Regulations)'.

The Inspectorate advised that no additional specific plans were required for development beyond the mean high water mark, providing the criteria set out in legislation under the Planning Act 2008 is met, including the APFP Regulations.

National Grid advised that all of the land marked on the plans adjacent to Camblesforth is required as a part of DCO for potential future expansion of the multi-Junction.

Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)

The Inspectorate advised the applicant that, where possible, Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) should be agreed prior to submission of the application and submitted with the application. The applicant explained that there are currently on-going discussions with relevant key stakeholders, including relevant local authorities, in relation to agreeing SoCGs. The applicant advised that progress has been made in relation to the SoCG with the Environment Agency in relation to an Environmental Permit.

Consents Service Unit (CSU)

The Consents Service Unit (CSU) also attended the meeting to advise the applicant on non-DCO consents and have retained its own note.

AOB

The applicant confirmed that Hazardous Substance Consent is not required for this application.

The applicant questioned if there is a need to submit further documents and plans for the offshore, non-NSIP part of the scheme. The Inspectorate advised that there is no requirement to submit additional information in relation to offshore elements of the

scheme; however the appointed Examining Authority may request further information during the examination.

The applicant confirmed that a Marine Licence would be required for the tidal river crossing and the offshore works and that this will be contained within the DCO as a deemed licence.

The applicant enquired whether the Consent Development Plan (CDP), which they have worked on with the CSU in relation to other non-DCO consents needed for the proposed project could be submitted with the DCO application. The Inspectorate advised that although this is not a statutory requirement for a DCO application, it may be helpful submitting this alongside the DCO application as an 'other document'.

The Planning Inspectorate explained that further documents cannot be submitted during the acceptance stage and that there is little scope to amend an application once submitted. As such the developer should ensure the application is submitted in its entirety.

The Planning Inspectorate advised the developer to refer to DCLG Guidance on the Pre-Application stage, Advice Note 6 and the section 55 checklist for guidance at this stage of the process.

The Planning Inspectorate advised that it may be helpful to send key documents to the relevant local authorities and key stakeholders upon submission.

The Planning Inspectorate re-iterated key messages that the applicant may wish to consider in the lead up to submission. These include ensuring that:

- i) all issues raised by stakeholders are resolved prior to submission
- ii) the ES is consistent with the DCO, particularly the mitigation measures and DCO Requirements
- iii) the Consultation Report, plans and Book of Reference are clear with no discrepancies
- iv) the full application is submitted, as there is little scope to amend an application once submitted.

Specific decisions / follow up required

- The applicant agreed to send to the Inspectorate part of the ES for the Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services team to review
- The applicant agreed to provide the Inspectorate with further draft land and works plans and draft Consultation Report
- The applicant and the Inspectorate will agree dates for future regular conference calls
- The Planning Inspectorate agreed to provide advice on determining deposit locations