



Meeting note

File reference	EN010092
Status	Final
Author	Karl-Jonas Johansson
Date	19 January 2018
Meeting with	Statera Energy
Venue	Temple Quay House
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Chris White (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Richard Price (Case Manager) Karl-Jonas Johansson (Case Officer) Emma Cottam (EIA and Land Rights Advisor) Applicant Andrew Troup (Statera Energy) Oliver Troup (Statera Energy) Julian Boswall (Burgess Salmon) Kirsty Cassie (Statera Energy)
Meeting objectives	Thurrock Hybrid Power Plant project update
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 outlined 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 stated that it was in discussion with the Environment Agency (EA) regarding the reciprocal engines that may be used in the peaking plant.

The Applicant is considering two Rochdale envelope options for the battery storage units (containers or buildings). The land needed to build the battery storage can only be estimated at this stage (following the Capacity market de-rating); the Applicant is expecting the development footprint to change with future system design and

improvements to power density. The need for the Environmental Statement (ES) to clearly set out the design parameters that would apply and explain how these have been used to inform an adequate assessment was discussed. This should include the footprint and heights of the structures.

The Applicant confirmed that it was liaising with Thurrock District Council. The land required for the Proposed Development is in land currently allocated as green belt in Thurrock's extant development plan. The Applicant stated that it expected the land required for the Proposed Development to be reallocated to business and industrial use in Thurrock's emerging Local Plan however progress on the Plan has recently been delayed by three months and it is not clear when a new local plan will be adopted; this could be at least 2 to 3 years away.

The Applicant confirmed that it had held a meeting with RWE who are developing proposals for the Tilbury Energy Centre, adjacent to the Applicant's proposed site.

The Applicant stated that it intended to hold one round of statutory consultation. The Applicant was advised to keep an audit trail of all of its consultation, including a summary of any which had taken place prior to its statutory consultation exercise. Any parties that did not engage with consultation should also be identified.

Scoping

The Applicant confirmed that it intends to submit its scoping request at the end of February 2018. The Inspectorate advised that it needed a GIS shapefile for the Proposed Development at least 10 working days in advance of a scoping request being made. The technical specification for the shapefile and the information which must be included with the scoping request is set out in the Inspectorate's [Advice Note seven: EIA: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements](#). The necessary basic case information would also need to be provided to the Inspectorate as soon as possible to enable a project webpage to be published. The Inspectorate cannot scope a Proposed Development until the case has a live webpage.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to be clear in the Scoping Report about which aspects/matters it proposes to scope out from further assessment and to provide sufficient justification to support the approach. The justification should be evidence based and have reference to the assessment process. The Applicant was advised to review the Inspectorate's Advice Note seven in this regard when compiling the Scoping Report.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that should a high level of uncertainty remain around key design elements of the Proposed Development at the time of submitting the scoping request, this may affect the ability of the Planning Inspectorate and consultation bodies to provide detailed comments.

The format of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) was discussed; the Inspectorate noted that some Applicants choose to present the PEIR in the form of a draft ES. The Inspectorate advised that the PEIR should generally demonstrate progression from the content of the Scoping Report, and should allow consultees to understand the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. Advice Note seven refers.

The potential for a site visit to inform preparation of the Scoping Opinion was discussed; the need for this will be confirmed at a later date.

Cumulative effects assessment (CEA)

The approach to CEA was discussed, noting that other proposed developments (including Tilbury 2, Tilbury Energy Centre and the Lower Thames Crossing) are located in proximity to the Proposed Development site. The Applicant was recommended to apply the 'staged approach' (as set out in the Planning Inspectorate's [Advice note seventeen: Cumulative effects assessment](#)) when conducting the CEA. The advice note provides advice on how to assign levels of certainty to other developments included in the CEA.

Compulsory Acquisition powers

The Applicant stated that the draft Development Consent Order is unlikely to need to include Compulsory Acquisition powers.

Draft Documents review

The Inspectorate set out what the service included and the timescales associated with it. It was clarified that whilst it was a voluntary service, most Applicants used it to help to de-risk the Acceptance decision. The Draft Documents service is set out in the Inspectorate Pre-application Prospectus:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/application-process/pre-application-service-for-applicants/>

Anticipated submission date

The Applicant stated that it intended to submit the application in July 2018.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that if the application was submitted without fulfilling the statutory requirements in the PA2008, the application would not be accepted for examination. It was further clarified that during the Acceptance stage the Inspectorate cannot engage with the Applicant.

The Inspectorate stressed the importance of providing the Inspectorate with realistic timescales so the case could be resourced when submitted.

Any other business

The Applicant informed the Inspectorate it had made good progress with its Statement of Common Ground with National Grid and that it had reached agreement with the EA regarding dispersion modelling.

The Applicant stated that in its view, it was unlikely that it would be necessary to carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The Applicant was advised to discuss and agree the appropriate approach to HRA with Natural England. In-combination effects with the other proposed developments in the area should be considered.

Specific decisions/ follow up required?

- The Applicant is to complete the basic case information template and return to the Inspectorate as soon as possible, to enable the case webpage to be published.

Post meeting note

The Applicant may wish to refer to the Scoping Opinion for the Tilbury2 project to help identify those local authorities which are section 43 consultees (for the purposes of section 42(1)(b) of the PA2008).

The Applicant should refer to the Planning Inspectorate's [Advice Note 10](#) (Habitats Regulations Assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects) to help inform its approach to HRA.