

DCP 407 Working Group - Meeting 05

21 June 2022 at 14:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Brian Hoy [BH]	ENWL
David Williams [DW]	SSE
Karin Cadwallader [KC]	BUUK
Kyran Hanks [KH]	Waters Wye Associates
Lee Wells [LW]	NPg
Martin Brace [MB]	UKPN
Peter Turner [PT]	NPg
Simon Vicary [SV]	EDF
Tom Cadge [TC]	BUUK
Vanessa Buxton	WPD
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG]	ElectraLink
Furqan Aziz [FA] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Working Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance” and “Terms of Reference”. All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting and agreed to the Terms of Reference.
- 1.2 An action log has been created and all updates are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Review of Criteria for Speculative Development

- 2.1 The Chair introduced BH to provide an overview of the Criteria for Speculative Development document drafted for the Working Group to further discuss. The updated document can be found as **Attachment 1**.
- 2.2 The key points of the discussion can be found below:
 - Within the document, the ‘Green’ column is not Speculative, the ‘Amber’ column is maybe Speculative and the ‘Red’ column is definitely Speculative.
 - *The first item of criteria was regarding ‘their detailed electrical load requirements are not known’. BH asked members of the group if they had any guidelines that can be assessed in relation to electrical load – PT suggested using the CIBSE (Chartered Institution of Building Service Engineers) guidelines as a starter for further discussion/review.*

ACTION 05/01: PT to review the CIBSE guidelines in relation to electrical load.

- *The Working Group also agreed to set the ‘definitely Speculative’ for the first criteria as 20% greater than industry guidelines and to include this within the Consultation to prompt further discussion from the wider industry.*
- *The second item of criteria was regarding ‘the development is phased over a period of time and the timing of the phases is unclear’. The Working Group agreed to include that the overall long timescale is more than 5 years and uncertainty is more than 2 years, but less than (or equal to) 10 years.*
- *The Working Group discussed the above criteria and agreed to include a further two related criteria under the same heading within the table, but with additional under whether it would be deemed as Speculative/non-Speculative:*
 - *Not Speculative – A clear phasing plan is provided for development / where there are less than 100 dwellings or where there are more than two permanent substations on the total site.*
 - *Maybe Speculative – An unclear phasing plan is provided for development / where there are more than 500 dwellings or where there are more than two permanent substations on the total site.*
 - *Definitely Speculative – A phasing plan is not provided for development / where there are more than 5,000 dwellings or where there are more than 10 permanent substations on the total site.*
- *The fifth criteria was regarding the capacity requested caters for future expansion rather than the immediate requirements of an end user(s). The Working Group suggested adding a*

description relating to ramp profiles and whether this is clear/unclear and provided/not provided.

- *The seventh criteria was regarding the capacity requested caters for future Speculative phases of a development rather than the initial phase(s) of the development. The Working Group agreed the below:*
 - *Not Speculative – When more than 75% of the total connections, or more than 75% of the total load (i.e., the higher figure applies) is to be connected in the initial phase(s) of the development.*
 - *Maybe Speculative – When less than 25% of the total connections of the total load (i.e.,) the lesser figure applies) is to be connected in the initial phase(s) of the development.*
 - *Definitely Speculative – The infrastructure only is being provided, with no connections for end users requested.*
- *The eighth criteria was regarding at least outline planning approval granted. The Working Group agreed the below:*
 - *Not Speculative – Project has achieved outline planning approval.*
 - *Maybe Speculative – No planning permission / not within Local Authority development plans.*
- *The Working Group discussed additional criteria, and agreed the below should be removed from the table:*
 - *The infrastructure only is provided, with no connections for end users requested.*
 - *Health Index (HI) and Load Index (LI).*
 - *Reinforcement Cost/kVA.*
 - *Percentage of development considered to be a Speculative Development.*
 - *Materiality Threshold.*
- *The Working Group agreed to include ‘unless otherwise determined by the Authority’ under the not Speculative column relating to the Special Circumstances criteria.*

2.3 After further review of the criteria table, the Working Group agreed to review the ‘Criteria for Speculative Development’ document (specifically the table) and provide written feedback prior to the next meeting.

ACTION 05/02: The Working Group to review the Criteria within the Speculative Development document:

- **Are options 2/3/4 individual criteria or should they be combined?**
- **Identify which of the ‘Green’ column would make a site be deemed as non-Speculative.**
- **Identify which of the ‘Red’ column would make a site be deemed as non-Speculative.**
- **Identify how many of the ‘Amber’ column would make a site be deemed as Speculative?**
- **Provide suggestions for any additional criteria that could be added to the table.**

3. DCP 407 Workplan

- 3.1 The updated workplan can be found as **Attachment 2**.
- 3.2 The workplan will be updated after each meeting.

4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:
 - 1. The Working Group to review feedback on criteria for Speculative Development.
 - 2. The Working Group to test criteria for Speculative Development.

5. Date of Next Meeting

- 5.1 The next Working Group meeting will be held on 28 June 2022 at 2pm.

6. Attachments

- Attachment 1_DCP 407 Draft Criteria for Speculative Developments
- Attachment 2_DCP 407 Workplan

APPENDIX A

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	The Working Group to amend the description of Speculative.	Working Group	Ongoing.
01/04	The Working Group to agree the characteristics (i.e., 75% of threshold met?) for Speculative.	Working Group	Ongoing.
03/02	The Working Group to consider alternate drafting for the timing of phases section within the guidelines for the next meeting.	Working Group	Ongoing.
03/05	The Working Group to provide real-life examples to include within the draft proforma to highlight the discrepancies for the Working Group to review during the next meeting.	Working Group	Ongoing.
04/01	The Working Group to see what criteria they can apply to access the appropriateness of the electrical load being applied for.	Working Group	Ongoing.
04/02	The Working Group to identify ways to specify a materiality threshold.	Working Group	Ongoing.
04/04	The Working Group to define Infrastructure.	Working Group	Ongoing.
05/01	PT to review the CIBSE guidelines in relation to electrical load.	PT	Ongoing.
05/02	<p>The Working Group to review the Criteria within the Speculative Development document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are options 2/3/4 individual criteria or should they be combined?• Identify which of the 'Green' column would make a site be deemed as non-Speculative.• Identify which of the 'Red' column would make a site be deemed as non-Speculative.	Working Group	Ongoing.

- Identify how many of the 'Amber' column would make a site be deemed as Speculative?
- Provide suggestions for any additional criteria that could be added to the table.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
04/05	The Working Group to identify the criteria that would deem a site as being considered as speculative/non-speculative.	Working Group	Closed.