

Meeting note

Project name	Ferrybridge Carbon Capture and Storage
File reference	EN0710002
Status	Draft
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	26 March 2024
Meeting with	Enfinium
Venue	Microsoft Teams
Meeting objectives	Inception meeting
Circulation	All attendees/ additional contacts to share meeting note

Summary of key points discussed, and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

The Inspectorate explained that the publication of the meeting note and creation of the Inspectorate's project website could be delayed up to six months, or until a formal scoping request had been submitted. The Applicant agreed to confirm following the meeting whether it wishes to request a delay.

Introduction to Enfinium

The Applicant outlined its portfolio and background as the third largest energy-from-waste (EfW) operator in the UK. Currently this consists of four operational plants and two in construction. Ferrybridge 1 and 2 are located approximately five miles east of Leeds, alongside the A1M, and comprise the largest EfW facility in the UK, with an existing railhead facility. The Ferrybridge site is in Wakefield Metropolitan District Council (WMDC)'s area, close to the boundary with North Yorkshire. The Applicant also explained that enfinium is owned by Igneo, and its sister company has related facilities in the UK, including one in Teeside.

Ferrybridge CCS proposals

The Applicant shared an indicative layout for how the Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) scheme might look at Ferrybridge 2. It outlined the components of the CCS process and how these relate to the development elements. The Applicant noted the site's industrial context, roads and other neighbouring sites. The indicative layout shows the absorber column to be no taller than the EfW plant's existing stacks. This is subject to further work, including air dispersion modelling and other detailed design.

The Applicant explained that the EfW facility consists of four existing lines in total, with two stacks for each plant (Ferrybridge 1 and Ferrybridge 2). These could be (subject to further

design development) combined into a single CCS line per facility. Around 1.5M tonnes of carbon per annum could be captured by the proposed scheme. Captured carbon would either be stored in liquefied form in spherical holding tanks for transport by rail, or compressed for pipeline transport as a gas. The processing and transport parts of the proposed development would be located centrally and shared by both plants. Both options are still being considered.

The Applicant explained that the proposed development is in two parts. The project of national significance is the CCS technology itself, as confirmed by a Section 35 (s35) Direction, as varied on 16 April 2024. This comprises various components, including for carbon extraction and for its processing and conditioning. There is also a range of associated development, such as control and ancillary equipment, transport facilities and modifications to the existing plants. Biodiversity and landscape replacement works would include some alterations to what was required under the previous Development Consent Orders (DCOs) on the site.

The Applicant explained that transport facilities and infrastructure are included in the proposal to the extent that they fall within the main site's red line – either adaptations to the existing railhead or a pipeline to the site boundary. Anything further required, such as continuation of any pipeline, would be a separate project. The Applicant intends scoping the DCO submission to include optionality for either transport method, and is mindful of issues that have been raised on other projects taking a similar approach. It confirmed that it is also in discussions with other operators about potential to combine the transport approach with other facilities, but not all options have clear timescales for availability.

The Inspectorate noted that optionality is not uncommon in NSIP process, but it is important to be clear on what each option involves, its effects, etc., including in consultation. It also queried whether the rail transport option would have capacity for all carbon produced. The Applicant confirmed that the railhead was originally designed for importation of waste and the estimated quantity of carbon that would be produced is within its capacity as this is much denser once in liquified form.

The Applicant noted that a Rochdale envelope approach would be used to cover the various options sought. The Inspectorate recommended that both transport options are included in the ES, rather than taking one as a worst-case scenario, given that the effects of each option are likely to be quite different. The Applicant acknowledged this and stated that this would most likely be determined on a topic-by-topic basis as for some issues there may be a clear worst case. However, it also acknowledged that a lot more work was needed to understand exactly how this would be taken forward.

The Applicant provided an overview of the consent history and overlap on the site. The DCO regime would help to deal with this complexity and therefore provide greater clarity for the project on timescales and deliverability. It noted that CCS is one part of its overall decarbonisation plan, with potential for the Ferrybridge site to become a decarbonisation hub, and the proposals have been designed to leave room for other elements to be dealt with later. In particular, any hydrogen production would be dealt with separately and most likely not through the DCO process as it is not a category of development that is automatically considered an NSIP, though hydrogen pipelines can be.

Programme

The Applicant advised it is aiming to submit a Scoping Opinion w/c 22 April 2024, Q4 2024 for its statutory consultation and Q4 2025 for submission, although it is mindful of the need to avoid both Christmas periods. It intends that the Preliminary Environmental Information for consultation will essentially be a draft Environmental Statement, to maximise the potential for useful input from statutory consultees. It noted this is a brownfield site with clear, well-known receptors identified from previous applications and construction works.

The Inspectorate advised of the need to ensure this latter point is well evidenced in the DCO process. This is particularly important if the Applicant is looking to scope out aspects of the potential Environmental Assessment, which may be possible for this project. The Inspectorate directed the Applicant to its Advice Note 7 in respect of the evidence requirements for scoping out aspects of a scheme or its effects.

The Applicant confirmed it has had preliminary discussions with WMDC, including obtaining their letter of support for the s35 Direction, and the Environment Agency, but the project is at too early a stage for work on the Statement of Community Consultation to have begun. The previous history of engagement in earlier projects on site (including a previous DCO) showed limited interest, and the Applicant intends to use this to inform the extent of consultation and make this proportionate, while taking into account anything that may have changed since then, such as subsequent other developments.

In terms of submission, the Inspectorate noted that anything past mid-November can be difficult in terms of resourcing the Acceptance and for Local Authorities in responding to Adequacy of Consultation requests. The Inspectorate also advised the Applicant of the option for a draft document review. This takes roughly six to eight weeks for a response, depending on exactly what is submitted, and the Inspectorate offer a post-review meeting to discuss any feedback. It advised the Applicant to build this into their timescales if they intend to use it, to ensure there is time for feedback to be taken into account.

The Applicant asked whether there were any known resourcing issues that might affect their programme. They noted there had been some delays in publication after deadlines in current applications. The Inspectorate advised that it is always aware of resourcing, and that it is important to have reliable programme forecasting from the Applicant to ensure they can make it available at the right times. If the Applicant or its team have experienced specific issues on other cases, it should feed those back to the relevant teams so that the Inspectorate can look into them.

Prior experiences and lessons learnt

The Applicant requested any advice the Inspectorate may have from previous CCS schemes, and noted that some members of its team had been involved in these.

The Inspectorate advised that the main points arising from schemes which had already progressed through the process were not particularly relevant to Ferrybridge as they dealt with matters such as protective provisions and pipeline route options. Cory Decarbonisation is at a much earlier stage, but the Inspectorate advised it has found some of the Early Adopter Programme elements particularly useful. These include the regular programme updates and the Design Approach Document. It noted that design is becoming an increasingly important matter for DCO applications, as reflected in the most recent National Policy Statements. If Cory goes through to Examination, it might be useful for the Applicant to look at those elements of the proposal documentation and incorporate them into its scheme where appropriate.

New NSIP regime

The Applicant requested the Inspectorate's thoughts on how Ferrybridge could take part in the upcoming new regime. Based on the recent Government responses to consultation document, the Applicant considers this might be an ideal case for fast track.

The Inspectorate confirmed that the prospectus for the new pre-application services should be published soon. This will set out the different tiers of pre-application support available, and it is worth noting that eligibility for a fast track examination will require a project to go through the enhanced service tier, and is also subject to resourcing requirements. It advised the Applicant to look at the prospectus once published to gain a fuller understanding of what this would involve and consider which of the pre-application options will be the best fit for the project. It should also be noted that there is an existing power to shorten examinations where appropriate, which is not exclusive to the fast track process.

Questions and AOB

The Inspectorate flagged that its new website is now live, hosted on the gov.uk platform. Advice notes are also moving to the new site and changing format to advice pages, though the old ones are still working for the time being.

The Inspectorate requested confirmation that its proposed project email address (ferrybridgeccs@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) was acceptable. Applicant to confirm following meeting.

The Applicant confirmed that it is not currently proposing any compulsory acquisition as part of the DCO application, as it is hoping to be able to do everything required within its existing site. This is subject to further work, however, particularly in respect of any requirement for offsite ecology works.

The Inspectorate agreed to confirm when the project webpage is up and running, and reminded the Applicant that the red line shapefile should be submitted at least 10 working days ahead of the Scoping Opinion.

The Applicant confirmed it would be reissuing the new case information form as the project contact details were now available. It noted that Ferrybridge CCS is the centrepiece of its Net Zero Strategy to be launched in May and would inform the Inspectorate when this was live.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- Applicant to confirm whether it wants a delay in publication of the meeting note and project page, and whether ferrybridgeccs@planninginspectorate.gov.uk is acceptable as a project email [BOTH NOW CONFIRMED]
- Applicant to submit red line shapefile at least 10 working days prior to submitting a Scoping Opinion [SUBMITTED 03/04/2024].