



Meeting note

File reference	River Humber Pipeline – Replacement Project, Feeder 9
Status	Final
Author	Pat Pikniczka
Date	11 February 2014
Meeting with	The applicant National Grid
Venue	The Planning Inspectorate Conference Room 2 Temple Quay House Temple Quay Bristol BS1 6PN
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Tom Carpen (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Pat Pikniczka (Case Officer) Hannah Pratt (EIA and Land Adviser) The Applicant Paul Lee - Project Manager (National Grid) Nick Dexter - Consents Officer (National Grid) Nicky Hartley - EIA Project Manager (Hyder) Chris Hehir - Senior Project Manager (National Grid)
Meeting objectives	Update project meeting, focusing on forthcoming screening request.
Circulation	All attendees

The applicant¹ was made aware of the Planning Inspectorate's openness policy (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 reply.

Project summary

Following introductions, National Grid (NG) delivered a presentation on the Feeder 9 – River Humber Pipeline Replacement Project; the presentation can be accessed from [here](#).

¹ Where the note refers to applicant, it refers to National Grid (NG)

The applicant advised that the project involves a replacement of the existing Feeder 9 natural gas transporter underground pipeline to connect from Easington to the national network. The proposed pipeline will be approximately 6km in length of which 4.9km will cross beneath the River Humber in Yorkshire in a bored tunnel. The proposed development only comprises the replacement of the pipeline as Above Ground Installations (AGI) needed for the project (Paull and Goxhill) already exist.

The Inspectorate was advised that the project transports regularly between 70-100 million cubic meters of natural gas per day.

The applicant explained that 7 Strategic options and 5 route corridors were initially considered. Following early non-statutory consultation carried out with relevant stakeholders and the local community, Route Corridor 2 is currently the preferred option.

The applicant advised that a bored tunnel is the preferred method for construction to house the pipeline having discounted open cut trench, horizontal directional drill and immersed tube tunnel techniques through an options appraisal process based on socio-economic, environmental, economic and technical factors.

The applicant advised that the existing Feeder 9 pipeline would be left in situ, filled with inert gas at low pressure and cathodic protected. Removal of the pipeline does not form part of this Scheme.

Consultation and key issues up to date

The applicant confirmed that there are on-going discussions with landowners on both ends of the proposed development around Goxhill and Paull. The applicant advised that there is currently an on-going discussion with the EA in relation to the use of the tunnel arisings and potential flood defence strengthening.

The applicant confirmed that there are ongoing discussions with a number of other bodies including Natural England; English Heritage; Marine Management Organisation (MMO); East Riding of Yorkshire Council and North Lincolnshire Council.

The applicant advised that they do not anticipate visual impact being an issue due to development being an underground scheme. On completion of the works there would be no change to the existing baseline as the pipeline would connect into the existing Paull and Goxhill AGIs.

The applicant advised that the project would be constructed in 4 phases and should take approximately 35 months, with 10 months of tunnel boring. The duration of the construction works would also be shorter on the northern (Paull) side of the development. The applicant advised that disturbance is a construction phase issue only.

The applicant confirmed that temporary rights are subject to be acquired for the proposed development on the Goxhill side of the project. The applicant explained that around 10 landowners were identified to be potentially affected by the project.

The applicant explained that they have defined construction traffic routes. The applicant is currently considering a number of options for dealing with the excavated tunnel waste during the construction phase including a potential beneficial re-use, for example, in nearby managed realignment schemes. Disposal of the material to landfill would be the worst case scenario. The applicant has assessed the implications of this on traffic as a worst case scenario.

The applicant explained that following discussions with relevant host authorities and highways authority, there are currently two potential options for access to the site on the northern (Paull) side of the Scheme.

Environmental assessment to date

The applicant explained that previous environmental surveys collected since 2007 informed current surveys and consultation. The applicant explained that information available from the other NSIPs in the area is useful in informing the proposal.

The applicant explained that they have undertaken an Extended Phase I Habitat Survey, are in the process of completing overwintering bird surveys and will complete other ecological surveys as agreed with Natural England. Moreover, the applicant has also completed a topographical survey, marine geophysical survey, a geotechnical desk study and will be undertaking a ground investigation. The Inspectorate was advised that archaeological assets in the area have been identified through previous geophysical surveys; the applicant is working with the local authority archaeologists in relation to this matter.

The applicant explained that the AGI near Goxhill was flooded in November / December 2013. The applicant explained that the Flood Risk Assessment for the Scheme was in progress and that the methodology has been agreed with the EA.

The Inspectorate was advised that diesel generators would be used during construction to power the tunnel boring machine (a BAT assessment was completed to inform this decision) therefore noise and vibration is potentially a short term issue and will be managed in accordance with industry good practice. The Inspectorate enquired whether the vibration from the tunnel boring machine (TBM) to excavate the tunnel would have an impact on River Humber. The applicant explained that boring at least 6 metres below the true bed of the river would reduce the noise and that studies of other schemes showed that the movement of the river bed from the tide and flow of water exceeded any noise and vibration from a TBM.

The Inspectorate advised the applicant to include all correspondence and highlights of early meetings with key stakeholders in its consultation report should the application be an NSIP application.

Screening Request

The applicant advised that they are currently determining whether or not the application is an NSIP development. The applicant intends to submit a screening request to both the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and the Planning Inspectorate at the same time. The applicant anticipates submitting its request in the second week of March 2014.

The Inspectorate advised that the issuing of a Screening Opinion takes 21 days, and that the applicant should supply 4 hard copies and one electronic copy of the document.

The Inspectorate advised the applicant that for the project to go through 2008 Act process, the application must be likely to have significant environmental effects. It advised that this is a separate consideration from whether a project requires an ES under Regulation 6 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2009 (as amended).

The Inspectorate advised that the applicant must come to its own justification when deciding whether the proposed development meets the thresholds set under section 20 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended). The Inspectorate advised the applicant to seek its own legal advice taking into account any screening opinion.

Project timescale

The applicant explained that should the proposed development be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), the anticipated submission date of the Development Consent Order (DCO) would be February 2015.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- Applicant to request a screening opinion from the Inspectorate in early March 2014