



Event Transcript

Project:	The Keadby Next Generation Power Station Project
Event:	Preliminary Meeting (PM)
Date:	20 January 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the event.

AUDIO_KEADBY-NEXT-GEN_PRELIM_SESSION1_2026-01-20

Tue, Jan 20, 2026 11:39AM • 19:59

00:00

Good morning, everybody. Firstly, can I ask those persons in today? Can they all hear me clearly? Please? I assume you can. And can I also confirm that the live streaming of this event has commenced. It has Mr. Allen, thank you very much indeed. Well, so good morning. It is now 10 o'clock, and welcome to this preliminary meeting in relation to the application made by keep being next generation limited for the proposed key be next generation power station. My name is Richard Allen. I'm a chartered town planner, and I'm an examining inspector, and have been appointed by the Secretary of State to examine this application as a single appointed person, I am the examining authority for this application. In the arrangements conference, you will, or may have already spoken to Caroline Hopewell, who is the case manager for the project, and she is supported by Georgie and Harry from the case team, also from the planning Inspectorate. So principally for those persons watching the live stream this morning and who've never encountered a national infrastructure examination before, I'm appointed by the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, communities and local government to examine this application and make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for energy security and net zero. I am an independent examiner tasked with testing the evidence presented and submitting a recommendation report. I am not here to simply rubber stamp this proposal the Secretary of State is at liberty to make their own independent decision, regardless of my recommendation. The preliminary meeting is the opening stage of the process. It focuses on the way in which I intend to examine this application. I will be discussing only the procedural aspects of this examination at this meeting, much as it may be tempting to do so, I am not taking any evidence at this meeting and not discussing the merits of the case or any concerns that people may have. That discussion will commence tomorrow, once the examination begins, and following the close of this preliminary meeting, this meeting will follow the agenda as set out in the rule six, letter dated, Monday, the 15th of December 2025 and for those of you who do don't have a copy of that, if you can go to our examination library, the reference is PD 006, and if you turn to annex A this sets out The agenda for the meeting, and we're currently on item one, and it is my intention to stick to this order. Now I have noted from the written responses to my rule six letter, although I have no specific detailed requests from persons present today to speak against any item and I have not received any specific written comments on it, I therefore propose to move through the agenda at pace, and I will, but I will give parties the opportunity to speak, should they wish to, and if you do wish to, I would be grateful if you could use the Microsoft Teams hand raising function. Please be advised that the MS chat function should be disabled and cannot be used, and all comments must be made orally. Now this preliminary meeting is scheduled to last for the morning. However, I'm very confident it'll be a very, very short meeting, and should be done within the hour, probably a lot less than that. However, should it take the full allotted time we may need to take a morning break at about half past 11. The recording of this preliminary meeting will be placed on the planning inspectorates website as soon as practicable after the close of the meeting. Please bear in mind that this is the only official record of the proceedings. Is this audio recording, tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of the meeting will not be accepted in evidence in this examination. So turning to those parties present today, and I have noted that we were not we don't have too many individual parties. I don't intend to do full introductions, but it would be helpful of those people that are here, if I could just acknowledge who you are, please, and just to confirm whether you do intend to speak on any of the items today. So if I start with the applicant, and I understand that's Mr. Latif aramesh, and please forgive me if I've not

pronounced that correctly, but if you could just confirm that you're here and confirm whether you wish to speak if it gets any item today.

04:47

Good morning, sir. My name is Mr. Phillip aramesh. Your pronunciation was perfect. I'm here representing the applicant, as you noted, in the interest of time. Sir, I wonder if I could just explain who's in the virtual room rather than going to each individual. And it's worth saying that. I'm afraid I'll be doing most of the speaking today, so you'll be seeing me on behalf of the applicant in the virtual room. We have Alastair Hilton, who's the lead consents manager at the at SSE, part of the applicants team, Richard Lowe, who's a director at Arup, Kirsty Cobb, associate director at Arup, and Jeff Bullock, who's the joint Managing Director of DWD. That is the applicant's team on the call. There are others who have joined in an observing capacity, but as I said, Sir, I will be speaking to the agenda items in terms of the specific agenda items to just make brief comments on. It would be helpful if we could please speak to Item three and item five. Thank you. Okay.

06:06

Thank you very much for that. And we have Mr. Law from the north Lincolnshire Council. Good morning.

06:14

Good morning, sir. Yes. Andrew law for North Lincolnshire Council. I don't have any specific items that I wish to speak on this morning, sir, just here to assist. Should you have any questions for the authority.

06:24

Thank you very much. And I understand Miss Stoneman from PD ports is here as well.

06:31

Morning. Yes, good morning, sir. Claire Stoneman, Legal Director at DWS law, LLP, as you said, representing PD ports, there's nothing I'm proposing to speak on at the moment, sir.

06:42

Thank you very much indeed. Thank you. Thank you. I'm not aware of anyone else that I haven't gone to. So is anyone else wish to introduce themselves who snuck onto the call that I'm not aware of? No, okay. Thank you. So again, if you for the purposes of the recording, if you can speak against when you we do speak, if you could just state your name and whom you represent every time that you do. And for the people watching the live stream, please, can I almost advise that, should we break at any point in these proceedings, we will have to stop the live stream to give us clear recording files, and as a result, you will need to refresh your browser in order to pick it up when we resume. So any other comments before I move on to item two on the agenda? No. Can't see any hands late. So I shall move on to item two, which is the examining authority's remarks about the examination process. I've set those out in the in Annex B to my rule six letter. I'm not going to obviously repeat them here. I just wanted to pick up on two key points really here for the purpose everyone. The first is to do with the general data protection regulations, ddp, we've set out in the rule six letter, it's very, very important that parties do not give any personal or confidential information. That is because the planning Inspectorate retains and publishes its recordings of these meetings and hearings for up to five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the application. So anything that isn't what you want in the public domain, please try to avoid giving that information out. The other thing I wanted to get across as well is the is deadlines, and the importance that parties stick to the deadlines as set out in the timetable. This is because late submissions reduce the time the examining authority has to read it, and if necessary, ask any questions and for the for other uninterested parties and even the applicant to respond to those submissions that are late are only

accepted at my discretion, and if I feel it would cause a procedural unfairness, I can decline to accept such submissions or hold them off to the next deadline. So that's all I wanted to say on that no parties indicated that they wish to speak against this item. And then, unless that changes in the next sort of five seconds, I'm going to move on to Item three, which is the initial assessment the principal issues. And just to say here that the the initial assessment principle issues is neither a comprehensive nor exclusive list of all the principal issues. It's an indicative list as I start this examination, but it does not determine the scope of it. It is possible that other issues will arise during the course of the examination which will appear to be important and relevant, and those other issues will be considered and examined and examined thoroughly when that happens equally, there are maybe issues that turn out to be not as important or controversial. As they it's me at this moment in time. Mr. Latif aramesh, you wanted to talk on this item initially. What? What would you like to say?

10:12

Thank you, sir. Mr. Phillip aramesh, for the applicant. It's just a brief comment to note that in PDA 001, the applicant's response to the rule six letter, we highlighted some discussions with North Lincolnshire Council on the veteran and ancient trees, and that is one of the issues that is identified in the initial assessment of principal issues. So it's just a flag that that issue, for reasons that we don't have to go into now is largely resolved, but that was just a flag.

10:44

So thank you very much for that. Yes, I did note that, and I will touch on that briefly tomorrow. I think you're right. I think it means that I probably just ask for a little bit more explanation on that at tomorrow's meeting. But, but, but yes, I do have some other questions on trees and woodland planting generally, but I acknowledge that that issue is now a common ground between you, and we'll touch on that tomorrow. Thank you. Okay, thank you. Any other parts you wish to talk about item three before I move on to procedural decisions? I can't see any hands up, so again, I will move on to Annex D, which is item four on the agenda. Annex D sets out the exam, examining authorities, procedures, decisions that I've taken since my appointment by the Secretary of State. Again, I don't need to read these out verbatim, but I would like to again draw on some key points, and I do have one question for the applicant, so the matters I wish have largely been answered. So just to deal with item one on that agenda, my wish for statements of common ground to only be submitted when they're signed and completed whenever, that is during the course of the examination, but the applicant to update me a regular deadlines with a statement of commonality, a statement common ground of kind of a table on color coded to to provide just an update of where you are with the discussions. And I'm from your letter, I understand that you're, you're happy to do that, so I, I thank you for that. I don't think anything else you wish to say on that matter,

12:25

must I let you finish with the applicant? No, sir, as you we were happy to oblige that.

12:30

Thank you very much. And while you're there, I'll just say that in respect of item five, that is to do with the new national policy statements that came out a week or two ago. Can I just confirm and in that, I said that I would like your written response. Now, in your response to me last week, you did provide the response. I just want to confirm that that is your final comments on the matter and that you'll be making no further comments. Or is that just a sort of a taster to what's to come. I'm not asking for I'm not saying it's insufficient or anything like that. I'm just trying to establish whether I'm expecting anything more or is that your comments in total? Mr.

13:13

Phility faromish, for the applicant, those are our comments in total. Should anyone raise specific parts of the newly designated NPS as new matters. Will respond to those, but we're not anticipating submitting any further information in response to your request.

13:29

That's fine. Thank you. And as you say, if I've got any further questions, I'll raise that either tomorrow, which which I don't think I will, but if I did or in written questions later on in the process, okay. Thank you very much. And then finally, nothing to ask on Item six about the accompanied site inspection, just to say that I I've noted there's no comments being received. So I look forward to receiving the draft itinerary. I think it's at the next deadline, deadline one. So thank you very much for that. Nothing else I have on procedural decisions. Does any anyone wish to say anything on that item? I can't see again, see any hands up? So I will move straight on to the draft timetable. This is Item five, Annex E. And again, I don't intend to read this out, but just to say a few words that I have attempted to reduce the number of deadlines and submissions so that we allow greater time for resolution of matters and to reduce the number of draft documents in the examination. And you will note as well that I'm intending to examine this application in just under five months, with the examination closing on Friday the 19th of June, I consider that there is sufficient time within this period to thoroughly examine the necessary matters, but I remind interested parties that it is not my intention to continue a repetitious cycle of questioning or invitation of responses once. Raised. Once I have an understanding the Party's position on a particular matter, even if the parties remain opposed to each other's positions, I will likely draw a line under that matter and report that conflict to the Secretary of State, as I find there's nothing really to be gained by continued repeating examination of the issue. However, should the examination prove to be in sufficient time, if new issues are raised, if change requests come in, I can issue a new timetable at any point in the examination and extend that time period. However, I will just report to interested parties that I do have a legal duty to complete this examination by Tuesday, the 21st of July, 2026 so does any party wish to talk on the timetable or the comments I've just raised? Mr. Latif Magnus, thank you.

15:55

Thank you, sir. Mr. Phility faramesh, for the applicant. It is, it is, again, just a brief comment prior to deadline. Four, you have a week reserved for potential hearings, and you very clearly say in the rule six letter that those will only be held if required. The applicant's team can be available for those hearings if you consider them to be necessary, but I thought it would be remiss of me not to mention some of the representations that you have received, including from Natural England and the Environment Agency, to the effect that they will try to attend hearings, but may not be able to, and in addition that they will focus in On the written submissions. And it's, it's for that reason that if you are minded to agree on foot for that week, if, instead of that, it was possible to have, rather than a round of hearings, a round of written questions, that might be preferable, so that the full extent of participation can be achieved for Natural England in the Environment Agency. But that is, that is just a very light preference, and obviously we're in your hands as to how you wish to proceed.

17:13

Okay, thank you. I will. I will consider that. I would. I would probably, well, I'm that is the week that I would want to hold the accompanied site inspection anyway, and so I will give, I'll give some thought to that over the coming weeks. And if I feel that the best use of time will be through through written questions that I will do otherwise, I'll bear that in mind. And just to actually say I should have mentioned as well your submissions. Mr. Latifa Ramesh, from last week, I have only published your response, your partial responses to the relevant representations and your letter the other documents. I'm holding off until deadline one, just so that, because they weren't requested by me, and therefore, I think as comments I've previously made regarding the deadlines, I feel it fair that those sorts of documents should come in at the deadline. So just to explain why, only part, part of your responses are published

for now, but, but, yeah, okay. Thank you for that. Any other comments on the top draft timetable? Do okay, that then brings us to the end of the meeting. If there's, is there any other business anybody wishes to raise before I draw this meeting to a close? No, okay. Thank you very much. Well, I'll just say that there's no relevant business. I'll remind you that the timetable for the examination requires that parties provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline one, which is Wednesday, the fourth of February 2026, and remind you that the recording of this meeting will be placed on the inspectorates website as soon as practical after the meeting. Thank you for attending today. It is a very short meeting, but then that's good. We shall answer. As I said, consider Mr. Lativo. I measure your responses today, and of course, going forward, particularly on the next round of hearings, we should obviously we're looking to issue our rule eight as soon as practical after this meeting, it's likely to be tomorrow or Thursday, and just to remind you that the examination stage begins tomorrow with the issue specific hearing one taking place at 10 o'clock in the morning, with registration commencing at 930 so thank you all again for coming today. It is now just shy of 20 past 10 and this and very much looking forward to examining this application, so this preliminary meeting is now closed. Thank you very much indeed.