

## Meeting Note

<b>Status</b>	<b>FINAL</b>
<b>Author</b>	<b>Robert Ranger</b>

<b>Meeting with</b>	<b>EDF</b>
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>20 July 2011</b>
<b>Attendees (IPC)</b>	<b>Mark Wilson</b> (Case Leader) <b>Sheila Twidle</b> (EIA and Land Rights Manager) <b>Rob Ranger</b> (Case Officer)
<b>Attendees (non IPC)</b>	<b>Richard Mayson</b> (EDF) <b>Tim Norwood</b> (EDF)
<b>Location</b>	IPC Offices, Temple Quay House

<b>Meeting purpose</b>	To discuss the forthcoming application at Hinkley Point in Somerset, and particularly the consultation being undertaken regarding the junction 24 site and highways improvement proposals, and the progress of parallel consents.
------------------------	---

<b>Summary of outcomes</b>	<p><b>IPC</b> shared that since their last meeting with EDF, they had met with local authorities to discuss the forthcoming application, and the coordination of communications in anticipation of its submission.</p> <p>They had also met with Otterhampton Parish Council at their request to discuss opportunities for public participation in the 2008 Act process.</p> <p><b>EDF</b> explained that they were now exploring the use of an alternative associated development site at J24, ("the Somerfield site".) This site became available late in the process. EDF felt it could potentially offer advantages, being a previously developed site and a storage / distribution facility, and so they decided to explore its use and consult on that option even at a late stage; and also proposed highway works in Bridgwater. The consultation opened on 1 July 2011, and would run until 12 August 2011.</p> <p>They apologised for any confusion arising from having previously advised that there would be no further</p>
----------------------------	---

consultation; but explained that this advice had been correct at the time.

They reported that responses to the proposed use of the Somerfield site had been almost universally favourable to date. However, a final decision on which site to propose at J24 would obviously not be made until consultation had concluded.

**EDF** were pleased to note that the suite of energy National Policy Statements had been designated. They also noted that the energy market reforms had been clarified and the proposed localisation of business rates, which they thought seemed equitable.

**EDF** restated their firm intention to submit an application before the end of Q3 2011. Work on application documents, including the draft development consent order (DCO), the book of reference, and the environmental statement (ES), was proceeding well.

**IPC** advised that where requirements in the draft DCO related to mitigation measures as set out in the draft ES, it would be helpful to see both documents and for a table to be provided in the ES to set out such relationships clearly.

**EDF** confirmed that this was in hand. They were also anticipating determination of the preliminary works application later in the month. The local authority planning committee were meeting to consider the application on 28 July 2011, and approval had been recommended by officers.

Remediation works on the site, for instance the removal of asbestos, were progressing but were likely to take a little longer than anticipated.

An application for a harbour empowerment order for the temporary jetty at the Hinkley C site has been made to the Marine Management Organisation, and an Inquiry is currently anticipated to be held on 15 November 2011. They are hoping to receive a decision in spring 2012.

They asked if the IPC anticipated any difficulties given the MMO's role as a consenting body on that application, and as a statutory consultee on the DCO application.

**IPC** confirmed that it was for the MMO to qualify any comments they wished to make to the examination as they saw fit.

**EDF** advised that they were to prepare the DCO to include

the jetty but that this element would be 'removed' should consent be forthcoming from the MMO.

**IPC** advised that it would be for EDF to demonstrate that this was not a material change to the application and that if the jetty was subsequently excluded from the DCO that the change was reflected in both the HRA and ES.

**IPC** asked whether EDF had given any thought to when they would advertise any acceptance, or what deadline they would set for relevant representations, should an application submitted at the end of Q3 be accepted.

**EDF** confirmed that they were likely to want to progress to examination promptly, but that they were aware that inviting representations over the Christmas period was generally undesirable.

**EDF** said that the HPC proposed development will include facilities for the storage of some materials classified as hazardous substances. EDF may seek a direction from the IPC, or the Secretary of State, that Hazardous Substances Consent was deemed to be granted when the application for a DCO was granted.

They were not clear what information needed to be provided at what time to the decision maker about the amount and type of substances to be stored.

**IPC** confirmed EDF's understanding that Hazardous Substances Consent could be obtained via that route. Officers present were unsure what information needed to be provided and at what point in the process, but would respond to any queries on that point in writing. Any direction would be distinct from the DCO, but could only be made when and if an application for a DCO were granted.

They suggested that EDF begin working with key consultees at an early stage; this is best practice with all parallel consents.

**EDF** will write to the IPC and set out their detailed queries in relation to Hazardous Substances Consent.

**EDF** explained that the Generic Design Approval (GDA) process for the reactor was ongoing.

**IPC** advised that proceeding without a GDA was possible; but carried a risk since an application could not be substantially amended once accepted for examination. However, the government was considering secondary legislation to set out a process for amending a DCO once

	<p>it had been submitted.</p> <p><b>EDF</b> said that they were aware of that, and confirmed that that the proposed generating station had been designed to accommodate any technical changes that might be called for by the GDA without the need for amendments to the application.</p> <p><b>IPC</b> advised that EDF should address the potential for transboundary impacts.</p>
--	--

<b>Circulation List</b>	Attendees