

# Meeting note

<b>Project name</b>	Humber Low Carbon Pipelines
<b>File reference</b>	EN070006
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Date</b>	22 June 2022
<b>Meeting with</b>	National Grid Carbon (NGC)
<b>Venue</b>	Microsoft Teams
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project Update Meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

## **Summary of key points discussed, and advice given**

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

## **Applicant's Scoping Report and Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion**

The Inspectorate noted that the adopted EIA Scoping Opinion (SO) is based on the information provided in the EIA Scoping Report (SR) at that point in time. The Inspectorate referenced paragraph 1.0.4 of the SO, which explains its content that the receipt of the SO should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultation bodies to scope aspects/ matters out of the ES, where further evidence has been provided to justify this approach. However, in order to demonstrate that the aspects/ matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES should explain the reasoning for scoping them out and justify the approach taken.

Discussion focussed on points in the SO which the Applicant wished to clarify with the Inspectorate, as well as how the Applicant intends to address matters raised in the SO. Key points from the discussion are summarised as follows:

### Socio-economics

- Regarding the scope of the tourism assessment, the Applicant requested clarification as to the meaning of the phrase "*away from the coast*" in SO ID Ref 3.9.3. The Applicant considered that there was negligible potential for impacts on offshore tourist businesses given the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider tourism businesses both along the coastline and inland which could potentially be impacted. The Applicant was advised to make effort to discuss and agree the specific receptors with relevant consultation bodies including North Lincolnshire Council and to justify the approach taken in the ES.

- The Applicant described its proposed methodology for assessing impacts to housing affordability during construction of the Proposed Development (SO ID Ref 3.9.4), which would include an estimation of total construction employment, the proportion of construction workers seeking temporary accommodation, information about local supply/ capacity, and a gap analysis to ascertain any likely significant effects. The Inspectorate noted that this appeared to be a proportionate approach and suggested the Applicant make effort to discuss and agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies including the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) and justify the approach taken in the ES.

### Human health and well-being

- The Applicant explained how it intended to approach the assessment of effects to health receptors arising from impacts to private drinking water supplies (SO ID Ref 3.10.2 refers), drawing on information from other technical assessments in the ES including hydrology and drainage. The Inspectorate confirmed that cross-referencing can be used to avoid duplication in the ES, provided it is clear to the reader where information is set out.
- In relation to SO ID Ref 3.10.3, the Applicant noted potential difficulties with anticipating and quantifying potential effects arising from perception about living in proximity to the proposed pipeline and asked whether the Inspectorate could provide any examples of NSIPs that had included an assessment of effects on mental health. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to review the scoping documentation on this matter for other similar Proposed Developments (such as HyNet North West Hydrogen Pipeline) and to discuss its proposed assessment approach with the UKHSA as appropriate.

Post Meeting Note: The Inspectorate advises that local community risk perception was considered as part of the Health and Wellbeing ES assessment for the Sizewell C project.

- In relation to SO ID Ref 3.10.5, the Applicant noted that the study area for the Proposed Development included approximately 80 Public Rights of Way (PRoW) due to the length of the proposed pipeline. To ensure a proportionate assessment of effects, the Applicant intends to consult with PRoW officers at the relevant local planning authorities to identify sensitive and/ or heavily used PRoWs as a focus of the work. The duration of any closures/ diversions should also form part of this consideration.

### Climate change

- In relation to SO ID Ref 3.4.2, the Applicant had given further consideration to which climate risks might be relevant during the construction phase of the Proposed Development and intended to focus the assessment on heat, precipitation and sea level rise, with the likely receptors being construction

workers and equipment. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider whether storm events may also be relevant.

- In relation to SO ID Ref 3.4.5, the Applicant explained that it was aiming to avoid routing the proposed pipeline through existing landfills in the study area but this might not be possible in all instances. The Applicant noted that as the existing landfills are historic, there is a lack of available data. As such, if a worst case scenario assessment of effects arising from release of greenhouse gases (GHG) is required, the Applicant considered this would have to be on the basis of assumptions. The Applicant suggested that the results could be presented as secondary effects, not part of the overall carbon balance of the Proposed Development, as it is a risk but not certain.

Post Meeting Note: The Inspectorate considers that the Applicant should make every effort to gather robust baseline data (including through consultation with relevant local planning authorities); for the ES to provide robust reasoning and a description of the alternatives considered if it is not possible to avoid routing the pipeline through landfill/s; and to explain and justify (in light of the baseline data and risk of releasing GHGs) whether the results have been presented as primary or secondary effects. Identification of an effect as 'secondary' should not be used as a means to downgrade such an effect.

- The Applicant confirmed it would be discussing climate matters with climate officers at the relevant local planning authorities to better understand the likely risks and constraints.

#### Landscape and visual

- In relation to SO ID Ref 3.7.12, the Applicant explained that it was applying a proportionate approach to identifying viewpoint locations, focused on the locations of above ground infrastructure (AGI) where the Proposed Development would be likely to have most visual impact. In relation to proposed crossings of the canal network, the Applicant confirmed that a viewpoint location has been selected for the Stainforth and Keadby Canal and that there are no AGIs near to the Aire and Calder Navigation.
- It was noted that Historic England (HE)'s scoping consultation response had raised comments about the need for dynamic and kinetic viewpoints, and consideration of viewpoints that are not publicly accessible in line with its guidance *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3* (SO ID Ref 3.7.12). There was some discussion about the overlap between the assessment of landscape and visual and cultural heritage effects. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to make effort to discuss and agree with HE any particularly sensitive receptors or views that might warrant assessment through a series of visualisations. The Inspectorate confirmed that reference to viewpoints from non-publicly accessible locations in

SO ID Ref 3.7.12 related to the assessment of cultural heritage assets not residential receptors.

- The Applicant advised that its landscape consultants would be coordinating with its heritage consultants with regard to selection of viewpoints.

#### Cultural heritage

- The Inspectorate confirmed that decommissioning impacts on cultural heritage receptors could be scoped out of the ES, as set out in SO ID Ref 3.6.4. Notwithstanding this, as per SO ID Ref 3.6.11, if any dewatering is proposed during decommissioning, impacts to organic rich deposits should be assessed where significant effects are likely to occur.
- The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to make effort to discuss and agree with HE the approach to assessment of any likely significant effects on heritage assets as a result of dewatering.
- In relation to SO ID Ref 3.6.5, the Applicant clarified that the study area for the purposes of the cultural heritage assessment would be 500m from the boundary, which would be refined as the design evolves but with the study area remaining at 500m. The Applicant intends to use the landscape Zone of Visual Influence around AGI locations to extend the study area in those locations, for the purposes of assessing impacts on setting. The Inspectorate advised that the ES should include an explanation of why the final study area has been selected, having regard to the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development and the extent of the likely impacts.

#### Other matters

- The Applicant was advised to evidence any agreement with consultation bodies on particular points relating to the scope of the EIA, within the ES and/ or in appropriate application documentation such as Statements of Common Ground.
- Following the close of the Inspectorate's scoping consultation, the Applicant advised that it had received comments on the SR regarding cultural heritage and PRow matters directly from Lincolnshire County Council.
- The Applicant explained feedback its community liaison team received following engagement with two parish meetings and two internal drainage boards (IDBs) and confirmed that on that basis, it was not intending to engage further with the parish meetings. It would continue sharing consultation information with the IDBs on a precautionary basis. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to record all consultation actions taken in relevant DCO application documents including the Consultation Report.