



Preliminary Meeting note

Application	York Potash Harbour Facilities Order
File reference	TR030002
Date	21 July 2015
Venue	Redcar Leisure & Community Heart Ridley Street, Redcar, Cleveland, TS10 1TD

This meeting note is not a full transcript of the Preliminary Meeting but a summary of key points discussed and responses given. A complete audio recording of the event is available on the Planning Inspectorate's website.

List of Participants:

Peter Robottom (PR)	Examining Authority
Morag Thompson (MT)	Marrons Shakespeares (York Potash Ltd)
Stephen Dagg (SD)	Bond Dickinson (Huntsman Polyurethanes UK & SABIC)
Kamran Hyder (KH)	Bond Dickinson (DEA UK)
Janet Horne (JH)	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

10.00am Welcome and Introductions

PR welcomed attendees to the preliminary meeting.

Examining Authority's remarks about the examination process

PR explained that the examination is primarily written, but that Compulsory Acquisition and open floor hearings could be required to be held at the request of interested parties and affected persons respectively.

Initial Assessment and Principal Issues

PR invited comments in relation to the initial assessment of principle issues. There were none.

PR remarked that Natural England has made representations that additional bird species may need to be subject of surveys.

MT confirmed that the applicant is hoping to agree a Statement of Common Ground with Natural England which will address the points in the initial assessment of principle issues and relevant representations.

Draft timetable for the examination and deadlines for submissions

PR drew the attention of those present to Annex D of his letter of 19 June 2015.

PR advised that due to issues of venue availability which have arisen, he is minded to move the site visit in the draft timetable to Wednesday 23 September 2015, with the Thursday 24 September reserved for an Open Floor hearing if that is necessary, and also for a Compulsory Acquisition hearing that is likely to be required.

PR also noted that the draft timetable presumed two rounds of written questions would be necessary. If it is not necessary, then the examination timetable could be shortened, subject to any outstanding work on protective provisions.

MT welcomed the suggestion that the examination could be shorter. She asked for any indication that PR could give on the timing of the first written questions.

PR explained that he hopes to issue them by 27 July 2015.

SD confirmed that his clients had met with the applicant, and that they were meeting with the applicant on Monday to discuss technical issues. They are hopeful that outstanding issues can be resolved. They have concerns about the proposed Compulsory Acquisition hearing in September, because they do not have confidence that they will have fully prepared their submissions by that date given the number of parties involved. He proposed that the hearing be held in October 2015, between 21 and the end of the month.

PR invited submission from KH or any other affected persons on the timing of the CA hearing.

KH confirmed that his client's concerns were closely aligned with those expressed by SD.

MT submitted that the applicant was content with the timetable as drafted; she noted that discussions between the parties had been ongoing for some time. She also noted that the CA hearing in September would contribute to the value of the DCO hearing timetabled for later in September.

PR confirmed that he had noted the submissions. He pointed out that the form of protective provisions for the chemical companies had been subject of extensive debate into the Dogger Bank A & B DCO and that the Secretary of State's decision on that DCO would be published no later than 5 August 2015. This may enable more rapid progress on finalising the protective provisions for this DCO. He invited any other comments on the draft timetable. There were none.

Local Impact Reports and submissions of the Local Planning Authorities

PR noted that Redcar and Cleveland had expressed a view on the design of the proposed conveyer bridge, but that his initial view is that the matter can be fully considered in writing.

KH noted that any proposal to place that infrastructure underground would be of concern to DEA UK; that they were likely to object to it and that a hearing might be necessary if such a proposal were to be proposed as an amendment to the application.

Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)

PR emphasised the value of meaningful statements of common ground. He invited MT to confirm the SoCGs the applicant anticipated being able to agree.

MT replied they were anticipating agreeing SoCG with the Environment Agency, Natural England, The Marine Management Organisation, Highways England, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council as the local highway authority, and Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council as the local planning authority.

Site visits

PR noted that he had viewed the site unaccompanied from public land and also the sites of the other elements of the overall York Potash project. He invited comments on how a visit to the site itself could be arranged, bearing in mind the security barriers both to the Port site and the MHF where the conveyor would originate.

MT confirmed that they will liaise with the Planning Inspectorate on the details of the visit, but noted that a health and safety briefing would be necessary as well as security clearance and that this would add at least 30 minutes to the anticipated couple of hours that it would take to tour the site on both sides of the A1085 by minibus.

PR noted that he would also want to view from other locations, but would do so unaccompanied where possible. He invited the Redcar and Cleveland's observations on whether the Dormanstown area and any potential impact of the overhead conveyor could be viewed unaccompanied. He did not anticipate the need to undertake accompanied site inspections beyond the immediate area of the proposal, subject to any further submissions on cumulative visual impact from Natural England.

JH confirmed that a visit to consider any potential impact on Dormanstown could be conducted unaccompanied from public land.

PR noted that his initial view was that the accompanied visit should be on the morning of Wednesday 23 September 2015, at 10am.

Other business

PR gave details of five written submissions had been received in advance of the Preliminary Meeting, which would be published online shortly afterwards.

PR invited any other submissions. MT indicated that a Draft Development Consent Obligation was intended to be submitted on 7 September 2015 and suggested that a deadline for this be added to the timetable.

Close of the Preliminary Meeting 10.50am