

## **Meeting Note**

<b>File reference</b>	<b>Deephams Sewage Treatment Works (STW) Upgrade</b>
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	<b>Rachael Walker</b>

<b>Meeting with</b>	<b>Thames Water (TW)</b>
<b>Meeting date</b>	<b>18<sup>th</sup> May 2011</b>
<b>Attendees (IPC)</b>	<b>Simone Wilding (Case Leader) Rebecca Pong (Senior EIA Adviser) Rachael Walker (Assistant Case Officer)</b>
<b>Attendees (non IPC)</b>	<b>Mike Carden (TW Project Manager) David Wilson (TW Senior Town Planner) Claire Cable (TW Environmental Technical Specialist) Andy Blaxland (Director, Adams Hendy Consulting Ltd)</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>IPC Offices, Bristol</b>

<b>Meeting purpose</b>	<b>Introductory meeting to explain the IPC application process and the roles and responsibilities of various parties.</b>
------------------------	---

<b>Summary of key points discussed and advice given</b>	<p>IPC advised on its policy of openness and transparency and the record of the meeting to be published on the IPC's website under s.51 of the 2008 Planning Act (PA 2008). Under s.51, no advice can be given on the merits of an application.</p> <p><b><u>Background Context</u></b>  TW explained that the Environment Agency (EA) has been progressively tightening the effluent treatment consents for the Deephams STW. The new consents which come into effect in March 2017 constitute a step change in the quality improvements required. To meet the new consents TW need to fundamentally upgrade the current works including providing a tertiary treatment process not currently provided at Deephams, whilst meeting the current treatment consents and ensuring ongoing treatment of full flows throughout the upgrade. The upgrade will also replace ageing assets and be designed to accommodate population growth within the catchment. TW explained they are currently investigating alternatives to establish the preferred option in terms of technical, planning, financial and environmental issues.</p> <p>TW set out the 3 main options that had been previously considered for the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• on the current site;</li> <li>• partly on the existing site and the remainder off-site;</li> <li>• on another site sufficiently close to the existing site.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Programme</u></b>  TW advised that they are at the very early stages of the project and have recently appointed a team of planning, environmental</p>
---	---

and design consultants. TW further reported having started engaging key stakeholders and reviewing alternatives to ensure that the project can meet the needs of the new consent from the EA: TW advised that their aim is to:

- draft the consultation strategy and statement of community consultation (SoCC) along with the relevant London Boroughs over the next few months;
- confirm the appraisal methodology and options being considered;
- choose their preferred option and complete the first stage of consultation by the end of 2011;
- develop the preferred option and carry out the second stage of consultation in 2012;
- submit their application by 2013/2014; and
- if the application is accepted and granted to complete the development by 2017.

TW indicated that the project programme including the application date is however dependant upon the option chosen, with any on-site option taking longer to deliver due to the constraints of building on-site.

TW advised that they intend to set up a Stakeholder Forum similar to the one that has been set up for the Thames Tunnel and had agreed this as a sensible approach with all key stakeholders with whom it had engaged with to date.

### **Process**

The IPC advised that it cannot comment on the substantive content of a draft SoCC, but could check a draft SoCC against the requirements set out in PA 2008, relevant secondary legislation and statutory guidance. Any s.47 consultation carried out must be in accordance with the proposals set out in the SoCC.. The IPC advised that each Local Authority(s) (LA(s)) in whose area(s) an alternative site location for the scheme is situated would be a relevant LA to consult on the draft SoCC if the s.47 consultation is to be started prior to the selection of the preferred site.

The IPC informed TW that any 'informal' consultation with the local community that is carried out in advance of the relevant LA(s) being consulted on the draft SoCC and the s.47 consultation being carried out in accordance with the proposals set out in the SoCC does not constitute formal consultation under s.47 of PA 2008.

Similarly any informal consultation with 's.42 consultation bodies' and other persons cannot count as formal s.42 consultation until the IPC receives a s.46 notification. A regulation 6 notification under the EIA Regulations 2009 (or alternatively a screening request) must be sent to the IPC in advance of carrying out consultation under s.42.

The IPC must inform the developer of those consultation bodies that it has notified under regulation 9 of the EIA Regulations 2009. Whilst this list may inform the developer's own consultation, it should not be relied upon for that purpose.

At pre-application stage, the developer may also request a scoping opinion from the IPC under regulation 8 of the EIA Regulations 2009. A site boundary plan ('red line plan') should be submitted two weeks prior to the request of a scoping opinion. The IPC will have 42 days to issue a scoping opinion, this includes a statutory 28-day period for consultation bodies to comment on what they recommend be included in the environmental statement (ES).

The IPC explained that all timescales once an application is submitted are statutory and cannot generally be extended. However, if during the examination it comes to light that the ES (or reports submitted for HRA) should contain further information, consideration of the application could be suspended pending receipt of further information. The IPC advised TW to look at its Advice Note 10: Habitats Regulations Assessment, and Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment, Screening and Scoping for more information.

The IPC explained the statutory timescales once an application has been submitted to go forward for examination including s.56 notification, s.58 notice certifying compliance with s.56, and the setting of the preliminary meeting.

The examination of the application commences the day after the preliminary meeting with 6 months to complete. After completion of the examination, the IPC has three months in which to make a decision if a relevant National Policy Statement is in place. If not, a recommendation will be made to the relevant Secretary of State who will then have a further 3 months to make a decision.

### **Future of The IPC**

Subject to the Localism Bill being enacted and coming into force, the IPC will be merging with PINs in April 2012. Promoters can be assured that applications will not be delayed by the integration.

### **Inception and Outreach**

The IPC explained the purpose of inception meetings and outreach events: to explain the role of the LA in PA 2008 process and ensure all parties fully understand the application process. At outreach events the IPC provides an overview of the major infrastructure planning process in generic terms (i.e. without reference to a particular case).

The IPC explained that outreach events can be held for the local community, LAs, statutory consultees etc depending on the local

	<p>interest and need.</p> <p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>The IPC encouraged the developer to send in a draft DCO well in advance, but no later than 6 weeks before the application's submission for the IPC to comment on technical/drafting aspects without prejudice to its eventual decision(s) on whether to accept the application or grant development consent.</p>
<b>Specific decisions/ follow up required?</b>	TW to advise IPC of project programme once it has clarified the preferred option to pursue.
<b>Circulation List</b>	<p>All attendees</p> <p></p>