



Meeting note

File reference	EN070005
Status	Final
Author	Siân Evans
Date	8 December 2017
Meeting with	Esso
Venue	Temple Quay House
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Siân Evans (Case Officer) David Price (EIA and Land Rights Manager) Mark Southgate (Director of Major Casework) (part attendance) Applicant Ian Fletcher (Jacobs) Shirley Henderson (Jacobs) Alison Segun (Esso)
Meeting objectives	Introduction to the Southampton to London Pipeline Project
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

Introduction

Esso (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 advised that the proposed development is replacement of an existing pipeline between Southampton and the Esso West London Terminal Storage Facility. This is to ensure a reliable supply of fuel for the future.

The Applicant advised that their preferred route corridor would ideally follow the route of the existing pipeline, but this is not always possible due to development over the existing line. A comprehensive route corridor selection process will be followed. Through non-statutory consultation the Applicant hopes to refine this and will present a preferred route to the Inspectorate at scoping stage prior to statutory consultation. The Inspectorate reminded the Applicant of the requirement to consider alternatives.

The Applicant advised that they will seek to reach agreement with affected landowners prior to submission of the application. The Inspectorate enquired whether the Applicant anticipated any problems with accessing land for surveys. The Inspectorate informed the Applicant that for applications progressing under PA2008, Section 53 is an appropriate power for obtaining access to land subject to legislative requirements and if there is no agreement with the landowner.

The Applicant advised that they intend to submit a detailed scoping report after non-statutory consultation which they hope will support them in preparing a proportionately focussed Environmental Statement. The Inspectorate welcomed this approach. The Inspectorate advised that Advice Note seven: Environmental Impact Assessment: Preliminary Environmental Information, Screening and Scoping will shortly be updated and will contain specific advice on the approach to scoping out topics.

The Applicant advised that the existing pipeline has interfaces with Crown (MoD) land, common land, fuel or field garden allotments. The existing pipeline route also goes through designations such as the South Downs National Park, ancient woodland, the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, Special Areas of Conservation and Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Therefore, the proposed pipeline may also interact with these. The Applicant confirmed that there could be archaeological interests along the route.

The Applicant advised that they will work with key stakeholders on their survey strategy. The Inspectorate reminded the Applicant to ensure that the methodology used to undertake the assessments is reflected in the Development Consent Order.

The Inspectorate encouraged the Applicant to start drafting Statements of Common Ground during the pre-application stage of the process with key stakeholders. Even if a stakeholder objects to the proposed development it is helpful to set out what matters are agreed, such as survey methodology.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider whether a Marine Licence will be required. This is necessary for any tidal water, including tributaries.

The Applicant advised that they were aware a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) would be required and intend to submit this with their scoping report. The Inspectorate confirmed that it is helpful to receive the HRA and scoping report at the same time.

The Applicant advised that the project is not related to the proposed expansion of Heathrow. The Inspectorate suggested the Applicant make this clear in their consultation material to avoid any potential confusion. They also advised the Applicant to set out clearly in documentation any interactions between the land required for this project and the proposed expansion of Heathrow, if this situation arose.

Project timetable

The Applicant advised that they propose to start non-statutory consultation in Spring 2018.

The Applicant proposes to submit their scoping report to the Inspectorate in Summer 2018. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to send a GIS shapefile at least 10 working days before submission of the scoping report.

The Applicant intends to start their statutory consultation in Autumn 2018 and the application will be submitted to the Inspectorate in 2019.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

The Inspectorate to send the new case information proforma to the Applicant to enable registration of the project on the National Infrastructure Planning website.

The Applicant to advise when they would like the next meeting to be held.