

# Meeting note

File reference EN010087

Status Final

Author Siân Evans

Date 20 April 2017

Meeting with Vattenfall

Venue Teleconference

Attendees The Planning Inspectorate

Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead)

Kay Sully (Case Manager) Siân Evans (Case Officer)

Hannah Pratt (Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor)

**Vattenfall** 

Graham Davey (Vattenfall)

David Tarrant (Royal HaskoningDHV) Alistair Davison (Royal HaskoningDHV) Norfolk Boreas project update meeting

Meeting objectives

**Circulation** All attendees

## Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

#### Introduction

The Applicant and the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) case team introduced themselves and their respective roles. The Inspectorate continued by outlining 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.

## **Project update**

The Applicant confirmed that they have completed the OFTO agreement lease with the Crown Estate for the cable route from the offshore wind farm to landfall. The actual landfall options/ site selection are yet to be decided but engagement with onshore landowners has begun and geophysical work for offshore is at the late stages of content.

The Applicant advised that nearly 1000 people attended their nine Public Information Days. These covered both this project and Norfolk Vanguard, which is intended to

precede Norfolk Boreas by one year (in terms of submission of the application for Examination). The Inspectorate acknowledged the advantages of combining non-statutory consultation for the two projects to make efficient use of everyone's time and avoid consultation fatigue. However the Inspectorate advised the Applicant to make it very clear what the key issues and potential impacts are for each project. There needs to be sufficient clarity in the consultation documents so that the public can properly engage and understand the projects. For any joint meetings that are held it would be sensible to keep two separate notes/ minutes for each project. It is also important to keep a clear paper trail of how the consultation for each project has been conducted.

The Applicant confirmed the intention for Vanguard and Boreas to share the same onshore electrical connection corridor and that the Vanguard project would include consent for the ducts of Boreas through which Boreas could pull the necessary cables. However, it was confirmed that the Boreas application will be made on the basis that Vanguard may not be consented or built and therefore it will also seek consent for constructing the onshore connection in its entirety. The Applicant and the Inspectorate noted the flexibility that will be requested in this regard and Inspectorate advised the need to be clear during consultation as to what the key issues are for the differing scenarios that may arise.

The Inspectorate and Applicant agreed that it makes sense to hold separate consultation events for the Vanguard and Boreas substations and cable relay stations as these will be in different locations.

## **Scoping**

The Applicant advised that they are intending to submit their Scoping Report to the Inspectorate on 9 May 2017. There are currently three separate shape files and the Inspectorate requested these be combined into one, to be provided at least 10 working days in advance of the scoping request. The Applicant asked if the list of Regulation 9 consultees could be provided at an early stage. The Inspectorate advised that it may be possible to send this before although as a minimum these would be included in the Scoping Opinion.

The Applicant stated that due to a number of requests to have sight of the scoping report, they would potentially publish it on their website as well however the Inspectorate advised that it usually discourages this and to avoid any confusion it is better if it is just published on the Inspectorate's website.

## **Evidence Plan - Steering Group**

The Applicant explained that it is considering merging the Evidence Plan Steering Group with that of Norfolk Vanguard and enquired whether the Inspectorate would be able to chair the Steering Group, which is likely to be held in June. The Inspectorate advised that Evidence Plans are becoming more autonomously led by developers, however we can chair these if requested providing sufficient notice is given and depending on available resource and location of the meeting.

#### **Intended submission date**

Quarter 2, 2019

## **AOB**

It was agreed that at this stage in the project quarterly meetings would be sufficient	It ν	vas agreed	that at	this stage	in the	project of	quarterly	/ meetings	would h	oe sufficient
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	------------	---------	------------	--------	------------	-----------	------------	---------	---------------