

Meeting note

Project reference	EN070001
Status	Final
Author	Adam Price
Date	13 December 2013
Meeting with Venue	Telephone conference
Attendees	Applicant Richard Gwilliam (National Grid Carbon) Liz Wells (National Grid Carbon) Will Bridges (National Grid Carbon) Planning Inspectorate David Price (EIA and Land Rights Manager) Hannah Pratt (EIA and Land Rights Advisor) Patrycja Pikniczka (Case Officer) Adam Price (Assistant Case Officer)
Meeting Objectives	Update on the Yorkshire and Humber Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Cross Country Pipeline Project
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of Key Points and Advice Given:

Project Update

The applicant explained that the White Rose CCS Project, jointly with National Grid's Yorkshire and Humber CCS project, has recently been awarded Front End Engineering and Design (FEED) funding from the government. The applicant stated that the provision of this funding enables the White Rose and National Grid Carbon team to work towards further funding gateways from government to build a full scale CCS demonstration project.

The applicant informed the Inspectorate that the submission date of the DCO application is delayed due to consideration of an alternative site for the pumping station. The anticipated submission date is as 8 May 2014.

Localised Consultation

The applicant explained that they had recently been contacted by the landowner of the field in which the pumping station is proposed, and that

the landowner had a preference for the pumping station to be sited in an adjacent field. The applicant explained that this option is currently being considered and that they plan to undertake consultation with s42, s44 and s47 persons affected by those changes at the end of January 2014 (post meeting note, this consultation is scheduled to commence on 12 February 2014). The Inspectorate guided the applicant to pages 16 – 17 of the DCLG Guidance on pre-application consultation for advice on consultation on changes to applications and advised that this further consultation should be clearly explained within the consultation report, perhaps in a separate section. The applicant should ensure that the Inspectorate can clearly understand the applicant's approach to the consultation carried out.

The applicant asked the Inspectorate for advice on how this should be reflected within Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI). The Inspectorate advised that they do not usually comment on PEI and that it is a decision for the project team to take, however advised that it would be sensible to provide any additional environmental information for both of the potential pumping station sites.

The Inspectorate asked how much the alternative site differs to the one that was originally proposed. The applicant explained that the alternative site is adjacent to and is under the same land ownership as the current option. The alternative site has already been designated as a potential lay-down area during construction; therefore the DCO boundary will not change substantially and would not result in new consultees.

Draft Documents

The Inspectorate advised that comments on the applicant's Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Report should be completed by the end of January 2014. The applicant welcomed this, stating that they hoped to have draft chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES) ready to send to the local authorities around this time.

The applicant stated they would submit a draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and draft Consultation Report on 13 January 2014 and asked when the Inspectorate would be able to provide comments on the documents. The Inspectorate explained that they would require at least four weeks to provide comments. The Inspectorate suggested that a more finalised version of the draft Consultation Report, taking into account the consultation undertaken on the alternative pumping station location, could be submitted again for review nearer the submission of the application. The applicant agreed.

The Inspectorate requested copies of draft land/works plans to be submitted with other draft documents on 13 January 2014. The applicant stated that there are a large number of plans and thus would prefer to send a selection of plans rather than the complete set. The Inspectorate agreed to get back to the applicant on this proposed approach.

Deemed Marine Licence (DML)

The applicant explained that they will be including a DML within the DCO for the River Ouse crossing and for all landfall works between high mean water springs and low mean water springs. The applicant stated that they have had ongoing discussions with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) regarding the DML, and that to date they have been through numerous iterations of the DML with the MMO. Furthermore, the applicant stated they hope to send both the MMO and the Planning Inspectorate the draft DML at the same time as the draft DCO.

Consent Service Unit (CSU)

The applicant explained that since the last meeting regarding the Consent Service Unit (CSU), they have been updating the draft Consents Management Plan which they intend to submit to CSU before the end of 2013. The applicant advised that they are currently drafting European Protected Species licences to submit to Natural England.

The applicant explained that the Environment Agency s150 consents (Removal of consent requirements Planning Act 2008 as amended) would be covered in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the body.

Planning Inspectorate Site Visit

The applicant advised that they would be happy to arrange a site visit. The Inspectorate stated it would be useful to visit the site prior to the DCO application being made and suggested organising a visit for March 2014 and agreed to confirm dates in the near future.

Date for next teleconference/meeting

The Inspectorate and the applicant agreed to a face to face meeting to discuss the draft documents, potentially in w/c 10 February 2014.

Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

The applicant explained they had confidence in the pipeline routing studies undertaken to date, however a 50m limit of deviation (LOD) would still be required either side of the pipeline. In addition, a 36m working corridor is required (15m to the north and 21m to the south) which results in a potential corridor of 136m. The applicant stressed that they would only typically take 36m during construction.

The Inspectorate asked how this would be assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES). The applicant explained that the 'worst case' would be assessed, whereby the whole of the 136m corridor is assumed lost. The applicant stated however, that this is not the realistic worst case and does not represent the effects they have been explaining to consultees throughout the pre-application procedure and as such they would also present a realistic case within the ES.

The Inspectorate asked how this approach would be taken into account by the proposed mitigation within the ES. The applicant explained that the mitigation measures would be based on the loss of features within the whole pipeline corridor. The Planning Inspectorate advised the applicant to clearly explain why this approach had been taken within the ES and ensure that the necessary requirements to secure mitigation are within the DCO. The Inspectorate noted that this approach has the effect of presenting an overestimated worst case.

The Inspectorate asked whether the DCO would specify a maximum working width. The applicant stated that they are currently deciding on their approach to take in this regard. Following this, the Inspectorate explained that it is important to make clear in both the ES and the DCO which approach was taken and the reasons why. As noted above the Inspectorate explained that a DCO without limits on the maximum working width would likely present an overestimated worst case.

Specific decisions/ follow up required?

- The Inspectorate agreed to provide comments on the applicant's draft HRA Screening Report by the end of January 2014.
- The Inspectorate would get back to the applicant in regards to their approach to providing draft plans for review.
- The applicant stated that they would provide the Inspectorate with the DML once this has been completed.
- Both parties agreed to organise dates for a site visit in March 2014.
- The Inspectorate agreed to confirm with the applicant whether the conference call on 16 January 2014 should go ahead and both parties agreed to organise dates for a face to face meeting in February 2014.
- The Inspectorate agreed to provide the applicant with outstanding meeting notes from June and September 2013.