Keuper Gas Storage Project 03/12/2025
Local Liaison Group
Minutes of Meeting

Item	Summary	Actions
Meeting	Keuper Gas Storage Project (KGSP) Local Liaison Group (LLG)	
Details	Wednesday 3rd December 2025, 6pm – 7pm, via MS Teams	
Attendees	Emma Dickson, Font Communications (ED) Yasmin Stretton, Font Communications (YS) Peter Scott, Storengy UK (PSc) Beth Thomas, Storengy UK (BT) Richard Stevenson, Ineos (RS) Nicki Mableson, Lichfields (NM) Janet Burns, ERM (JBu) Andrea Stott, Byley PC (AS) Simon Moorehead, Byley PC (clerk) (SM) John Beecroft, Byley PC (JB) Steven Holmes, Cheshire West and Chester Council (SH) Hazel West, Allostock PC (HW) Lyndsay Sanderson (LS) Apologies: Tony Roberts, Lach Dennis and Lostock Green PC (TR) Julia Wilson, Allostock PC	
Item 1	**Welcome, introductions and approval of previous minutes**	
	Chair ED welcomed attendees to the meeting and provided introductions. The minutes from the previous meeting were discussed and agreed that all outstanding actions were completed.	
Item 2	**Public Consultation**	
	ED and NM ran through a brief update on Public Consultation including a summary of what has taken place, common themes arising through the public consultation feedback and covered next steps to submission of the Material Change application to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Questions raised by attendees: AS asked if there were any dates around the timeline for the project next steps. BT suggested that KGSL are working towards submitting the application in March 2026. Key dates will be added to the slides for distribution to the LLG AS asked about the 28-day period to submit further comments to PINS and when this would be. NM explained that the time guidance on the supporting presentation (slide 7) adheres to the maximum period of time each stage could take and marks the project's current progress. NM clarified that anyone can make representations on an application for a material change either in	BT

	response to having been notified of the application for change or as a result of having seen the notice publicising the application. AS asked about the proposed revisions to the National Planning and Infrastructure Bill and whether this was factored into the KGSP timeline. NM answered that KGSL had taken legal advice but that at the moment the project was adhering to existing NSIP timelines.	
Item 3	**Brine Leakage Response**	
	RS provided an update on Brine Leakage in response to Lach Dennis and Lostock Gralam Parish Council. RS confirmed that some of the INOVYN infrastructure dates back to the 1950's and 1960's and has in the past led to leaks. • INOVYN now has a renewal programme to replace this aging infrastructure, investing millions of pounds in recent years. • On the KGSP site all the brine infrastructure will be new, built to the highest standards and fully tested. • On the existing Holford site all the infrastructure that will be used by the project will be inspected and tested to ensure integrity and suitability; • Any infrastructure that is deemed not suitable will be relined or replaced. • Separate to the proposed hydrogen storage project, INOVYN will be undertaking a comprehensive programme of works to ensure the integrity of its infrastructure to support the supply of brine to its customers. Questions raised by attendees: AS asked about gas pipe work being tested. RS answered that the queries around brine were predominantly to do with historic brine leaks. AS asked if brine being pumped out now was less continuous and is therefore a lower volume. RS answered that brine is being produced externally to the project all the time. He explained that this project would produce brine for a period of time but not enough to put pressure on the existing system. He also explained that the existing pipelines had dealt with much higher levels of brine in the past, when compared to current levels.	
Item 4	**Electrical Infrastructure Response**	
	BT provided a summary of the Electrical Infrastructure Grant response which was raised at the last LLG meeting. A briefing note is to be circulated following the LLG meeting. • Guidance applies to ‘onshore electricity transmission network infrastructure projects’ for large scale upgrades to the electricity grid. • Guidance aimed at owners, operators and developers of high voltage (275-400kV) electricity transmission networks. • For this area of the UK is National Grid.	**Font Comms to circulate briefing note**

	• KGSP has consent, through the existing DCO, to connect to existing (132kV) distribution network. • Further info available in the provided briefing note. Questions raised by attendees: AS asked about the existing substation and whether this was the same as the existing consent. BT explained that guidance is aimed at very high voltage projects and that the grid connection for KGSP is lower than this. AS re-asserted that the paper referred to relevant community benefit for electrical infrastructure as being above 500k. RS explained that the guidance doesn't apply. AS clarified that the information about the Government guidance was raised in the September LLG meeting previously to draw attention to the compensation offered in that scenario and not in line of sight to a specific sub-station but to draw parallels with the community benefit fund aspects that developers have offered elsewhere. AS requested that KGSL consider the guidance in relation to KGSP as the community is affected by the infrastructure and that the technicals of the paper are irrelevant. JB requested that AS have her point registered in the minutes. PS assured the LLG that some questions regarding this may be answered by the guidance document and that they would be happy to follow up and answer any further questions.	
Item 5	**Questions and AOB**	
	A proposed date for the next meeting will be circulated. JB asked for clarification about the organisation and structure of the project legally between Ineos and Storengy. RS explained that KGSL is the legal entity owning planning consent and other consent for the project. Ineos owns the site and leases it to KGSL who will operate the site. Ineos and Storengy are in partnership for the project. RS explained that both companies (INOVYN and Storengy) have separate boards and companies. JB asked how the partnership works. PS explained that Storengy has a memorandum of understanding with INOVYN. PS explained that the project is aiming to join the HyNet cluster with early Government support. AS asked about accountability and responsibility within KGSL, with regard to health and safety or is this something which happens later down the line. RS explained that both companies have responsible managers for the project with Ineos holding the insurance. AS asked about public liability insurance and senior responsible officers. She asked who Costain had been appointed by. PS answered that Storengy had appointed them.	

	RS explained that he would need to clarify what is in the public domain and what was commercially sensitive information that would be released. RS has said he will take this away and get further information but that directors of KGSL and other companies involved can be found on Companies House. AS asked who the managing director of KGSL is. RS explained that he is contracted to INOVYN not KGSL. He affirmed that any issues on the project should come to the LLG and the team on the call. JB asked about the consultation timeline and when planning would be put into PINS. ED affirmed that the consultation was a statutory process and in line with government guidelines for a NSIP Material Change application and that the team would attempt to nail down these dates after feedback has been analysed as the next step of the process. JB explained that the LLG reserve the rights for further comments. AS mentioned that noise was a worry for residents. AS asked about what winning competition in relation to HyNet means. PS explained that four moving parts are needed for hydrogen production and that KGSL would compete under the hydrogen storage section. He explained that one cluster in the UK would get government funding, hence putting different clusters across the country in competition (HyNet and East Coast Cluster). AS explained that residents were concerned with what the impact of the project would be and that there would be further questions. ED reassured the LLG that contact channels would remain open for questions about the project. JB asked when the next meeting of the LLG will be and that he would appreciate knowing ahead of permission going in. AS suggested LLG meetings should be held on a monthly basis until submission. Post meeting note: KGSL agrees with the LLG suggestion that more frequent meetings would be beneficial to allow consistent feedback to the community.	RS