# Keuper Gas Storage Project 25/02/2025
# Local Liaison Group
# Minutes of Meeting

| Item | Summary | Actions |
|---|---|---|
| **Meeting** | Keuper Gas Storage Project (KGSP) Local Liaison Group (LLG) | |
| **Details** | Wednesday 25th February 2025, 6pm – 7pm, via MS Teams | |
| **Attendees** | Emma Dickson, Font Communications (ED)<br>Yasmin Stretton, Font Communications (YS)<br>Paul Snary, Storengy UK (PS)<br>Beth Thomas, Storengy UK (BT)<br>Richard Stevenson, Ineos (RS)<br>Nicki Mableson, Lichfields (NM)<br>Andrea Stott, Byley PC (AS)<br>John Beecroft, Byley PC (JB)<br>Hazel West, Allostock PC (HW)<br>Lyndsay Sanderson (LS)<br>Tony Roberts, Lach Dennis and Lostock Green PC (TR)<br>Ian Hodge, Byley PC (IH)<br><br>Apologies:<br>Julia Wilson, Allostock PC<br>Steven Holmes, Cheshire West and Chester Council (SH)<br>Simon Moorehead, Byley PC (clerk) (SM) | |
| **Item 1** | **Welcome, introductions and approval of previous minutes** | |
| | Chair ED welcomed attendees to the meeting and provided introductions.<br><br>The minutes from the previous meeting were discussed and agreed that all outstanding actions were completed. | |
| **Item 2** | **KGSL Organisational Structure** | |
| | RS briefly ran through the structure of INEOS, according to the slides shared, confirming INEOS and INOVYN as the parent company registered in the UK. He explained how INOVYN has been creating caverns in Cheshire for over 100 years.<br><br>RS explained that INOVYN Enterprises LTD is the landowner of the Holford Brinefield and is involved as provider of water and off-taker of brine for the project.<br><br>KGSL is a special purpose vehicle set up in 2013 for this project which is common for developers progressing NSIPs in the UK. Its parent is INOVYN ChlorVinyls Ltd, based in Runcorn.<br><br>PS briefly outlined the structure of Storengy, including its parent company Engie which is based in France. Storengy's gas storage expertise is being used to support specialist design of the project. | |
| **Item 3** | **February 2026 Interim Update** | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | BT provided an interim update on the project, running through the documentation of feedback into the MC Application and the circulation of the E-Newsletter which was sent out this month, providing signposting for common questions on the project.<br><br>Questions raised by attendees:<br><br>AS asked if whether there were still ongoing pieces of work which would form part of the application.<br><br>BT suggested we move to the next section to answer this question. | |
| **Item 4** | **Next Steps and Planning Process** | |
| | BT explained the next steps of the application and outlined the relevant documentation which is required for submission.<br><br>PS explained that KGSL were three to four weeks from submitting with most documentation completed.<br><br>Questions raised by attendees:<br><br>AS asked whether the LLG would see updated drawings before they are submitted if they have been changed.<br><br>BT explained that if the scheme drawings were changed significantly that we would have to re-enter the consultation again to meet guidelines. The design of the scheme remains as per details shared during consultation, the updates to the drawing are for compliance with NSIP application specifications.<br><br>AS asked if there was further detail on the HAGI and pipeline.<br><br>PS answered that the HAGI hasn't moved and that the hydrogen pipeline connection and wider hydrogen network to the site is being progressed by Cadent.<br><br>AS asked If Cadent had provided updated drawings to KGSL.<br><br>PS agreed that we could look into providing the LLG with a copy of these drawings.<br><br>RS re-affirmed that that cavities and wellheads were not going to move or change design.<br><br>AS asked about updates to the environmental statement and whether this was in the current PIER documents.<br><br>BT explained that all final EIA assessments have now been completed and will be part of the final application to the SoS.<br><br>JB asked if they would get to see this.<br><br>BT explained that this would be available after the application has been validated with every other document which is submitted. | PS/ BT |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | NM explained that PINS would take 28 days to validate the application, and that the PIER would evolve to become the environmental statement (ES) at this point which would largely resemble the PIER.<br><br>AS asked if there were details on what would be changed from the PIER. BT explained that everything has been assessed for the EIA assessment which will go to PINS for viewing and the opportunity for people to comment.<br><br>RS briefly ran through the documentation on the slides and outlined the changes to documents.<br><br>Questions asked by attendees:<br><br>AS asked whether the newsletter illustrated the changes to the materials and asked how much additional information there would be at the point of submission. BT explained that it signposted people to existing materials.<br><br>PS explained that KGSL had abided by guidelines set out by PINS and enforced that the documents were being refined and then would be available to view.<br><br>JB asked whether any submission documentation would be available for Byley at the same time as it is submitted to PINS.<br><br>NM then outlined the next stages of the planning process including upcoming notices and letters and the opportunity to comment to PINS.<br><br>AS asked which newspapers notices would be published in and whether Byley was a prescribed consultee.<br><br>RS / ED answered that it would be Northwich, Middlewich and Winsford Guardian and that Byley and Lach Dennis PC was a prescribed consultee.<br><br>AS asked if anyone would know when KGSL submits, NM explained that the notices would<br>be published once the application is accepted by PINS.<br><br>PS explained that communication channels would remain open until the application is validated at which point questions should go to the planning inspectorate. | BT to take this away and check. |
| **Item 5** | **Questions and AOB** | |
| | A proposed date for the next meeting will be circulated but is suggested to be in May.<br><br>JB asked where we sit on the timeline.<br><br>NM explained that the timeline is prescribed by the statutory NSIP timeframes, with the non-statutory sections being proposed from other NSIP projects, but that this is not set in stone. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | JB asked how examination works and how long the whole process would take. NM explained that this may incorporate questions/ hearings on topic issues and the issues PINS want to examine in more detail. It was suggested that the decision is likely to fall this time next year.<br><br>AS asked about the Cadent DCO. PS explained that the Cadent DCO has been put on hold.<br><br>AS asked about Coates expanding and if this would affect the project. BT explained that the 'Cumulative Effects' chapter of the ES, which incorporates assessment of current planning applications, will be included in the application documentation. AS asked if she could see what other projects/ changes would be highlighted in this report.<br><br>RS explained COMAH processes were not a part of this section of the ES or Material Change application. | BT said she would pull together a list. |