



Meeting note

File reference	BC030001
Status	Final
Author	Karl-Jonas Johansson
Date	5 November 2015
Meeting with	International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP)
Venue	2 Rivergate, Bristol
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Jessica Powis (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Susannah Guest (Infrastructure Planning Lead) Sheila Twidle (Head of Environmental Services) Richard Hunt (Senior EIA Advisor) Karl-Jonas Johansson (Case Officer) Melanie Bischer (Consents Service Unit) Lyndon Baker (Consents Service Unit) Applicant Mark Reynolds (IAMP Project Coordinator) James Lough (Arup) Matt Verlander (Arup) Highways England Helen Apps (dialled in for A19 Testos and Down Hill Lane Junction part of the meeting)
Meeting objectives	Project update meeting
Circulation	All attendees.

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised on its openness policy, that any advice given will be recorded and placed on the National Infrastructure Portal website under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended (PA2008) and also to note that any advice given under section 51 does not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) can rely. It was further clarified that the Consents Service Unit (CSU) advice is not bound by s.51.

Project Update

The applicant provided a progress update on the International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP) project, available [here](#). The current Programme for the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is for stage 1 statutory consultation in

Spring 2016, stage 2 statutory consultations in late 2016 and submission of the DCO application to the Inspectorate in Spring 2017. The applicant anticipates submitting an EIA scoping request in Spring 2016.

The Inspectorate advised that past experience suggests that undertaking statutory consultation at the same time as requesting a scoping opinion has led to confusion among stakeholders and ideally should be avoided if possible.

Rights of Entry

The applicant highlighted that 18 months of ecological survey work had already been carried out. The applicant explained that it has aimed to negotiate access to the land it needs to survey but clarified that they may have to apply for authorisation under s.53 of PA2008 to access some of the land. This is for ecological surveys and for ground investigation works.

The Inspectorate advised that it might be prudent to apply for separate authorisations so that the ecological studies that are seasonally critical could be advanced. The applicant was also advised to consult the Inspectorate's Advice Note 5 for further information regarding s.53 applications and to keep the Inspectorate informed of the likely timing of the requests.

Project boundary

The applicant clarified that the red line boundary denoting the order limits for the DCO project had yet to be finalised. The applicant is in the process of work to refine the boundary which will be informed by the parallel Area Action Plan (AAP) process and ongoing discussions with Highways England (HE) in respect of their separate DCO application for A19 Testos and Down Hill Lane Junction.

The reason for this dependency is that the one of the main access points for the IAMP will be determined by the separate HE application and improvements to the junctions will be necessary to deliver the full extent of the IAMP project.

The applicant informed the Inspectorate that its highways modelling work is currently being completed. A key part of that analysis is to understand the extent of highway works on the strategic road network that will be required to enable the IAMP project to proceed. The applicant will be working closely with HE to ensure that information is shared between the two projects and consultation activity is coordinated as far as possible.

Area Action Plan

The applicant gave an update regarding the emerging AAP which is required to change the planning policy status of the site (currently designated as green belt). A publication draft AAP is due in May 2016, with submission of a final AAP anticipated in December 2016.

Land issues

The applicant explained that the land needed for the project is split amongst several owners and that discussions are ongoing to enter into private agreements with the land owners rather than having to rely on compulsory acquisition. The applicant stated

that the River Don is a designated waterbody under the Water Framework Directive and that there are protected species in the area.

The applicant confirmed that there are no coal mines on the site.

The option of an energy centre on the site was discussed with the applicant advising of a renewable energy feasibility study which may confirm the viability of the project utilising renewables. The CSU advised that if they wished to operate an energy recovery facility or biomass plant on site, they would also require an environmental permit from the Environment Agency (EA). They should therefore contact the EA as soon as possible to discuss these requirements. This would need to be clarified prior to consultation so that the public knew what to expect. The applicant advised that any power plant would be likely to be under 50 MW.

Project promoter

The scheme promoter for the IAMP project will be a development company owned by the two host authorities: Sunderland City Council and South Tyneside Council. This company would be able to execute the duties relating to planning, land acquisition, infrastructure and funding for the project and would be the body that submits the application. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to consider, in setting up the development company, how it will be able to demonstrate the security of funding should compulsory acquisition powers be sought in the DCO.

The funding approach for the project was discussed and the applicant was recommended to be clear in its funding statement from where the various funding streams would originate.

Project Delivery

The applicant envisages delivering the IAMP project in a number of phases, with an initial development parcel or parcels potentially representing approximately 30ha of the total 150ha scheme. All phases would be covered by a single DCO application. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to give early consideration to how this may be achieved through the DCO in terms of the environmental assessment. The example of DCO drafting mechanisms used previously on strategic rail freight terminal DCO projects was discussed.

The applicant explained that it plans to bring forward serviced development plots for onward sale to occupiers. It may not therefore be in a position to specify all of the design details of the scheme at the point of DCO submission. Consequently, the applicant is likely to seek to set design parameters in the DCO application, with the intention that outstanding design details are subject to subsequent approval via the discharge of DCO requirements.

The Inspectorate advised that a DCO application is not akin to an outline planning application and therefore the design needs to be fixed as far as possible at the point of application submission. Where it is not possible to fix some project details, the applicant may decide to define parameters for development within the DCO and use the Rochdale envelope approach to environmental assessment. The applicant should explain the reasons for this approach within the application documentation. The Inspectorate's Advice Note 9 provides further information about how to take forward this approach whilst also satisfying the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 regime.

In addition, given the proposed delivery model, the Inspectorate advised the applicant to consider how the benefits and liabilities conferred in the DCO may be transferred or apportioned in the future.

Application Documents

Given that the project site will straddle two local authority areas, the Inspectorate advised that the DCO needs to be clear on who will be responsible for, for example, the discharge of requirements (akin to planning conditions) and enforcement in relation to the DCO. The possibility of the applicant agreeing with the local authorities that one of them has the power to perform these functions on behalf of the two authorities was discussed.

The Inspectorate explained that since there is no National Policy Statement (NPS) for Business and Commercial projects, the applicant should consider what information it needs to submit with the application to demonstrate the need for the project and its acceptability in policy terms, i.e. relevant national, regional and local policy.

The applicant was advised to share its draft documents with the main stakeholders and that the Inspectorate can review certain draft documents such as the Book of Reference, the Consultation Report, the DCO, Plans, Planning Statement and the draft HRA report if provided in good time prior to submission of the application.

Highways England

HE dialled into the meeting to discuss the interrelationship between the IAMP project and the A19 Testos and Downhill Lane Junction projects. To ensure that the two related schemes in the area are fully aware of where they are in the application process Highways England and the Applicant hold regular meetings.

HE informed the Inspectorate that the A19 Testos and Down Hill Lane Junction application is likely to be submitted in late 2017, which is after the IAMP application is due to have been submitted. HE further advised that scoping is planned for Autumn 2016 and statutory consultation on a preferred route option in late 2016. HE and the applicant agreed that there may be opportunities to combine or coordinate consultation events with a view to minimizing consultation fatigue and confusion among stakeholders.

Consents Service Unit

The CSU explained their role in the process and how they can assist the applicant. Clarification was provided about the Letter of No Impediment process when submitting a draft licence application to Natural England prior to the DCO being issued and about additional help that can be obtained under Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service.

They noted that flood defence consent would be required for the bridge to cross the River Don. Other environmental permits may be required to use, store, treat and dispose of waste.

The CSU committed to providing further information about their service by email.

Further Engagement

The Inspectorate and applicant agreed that holding monthly meetings would be helpful. It was agreed that alternating `phone conferences and face to face meetings would be trialled. There was some discussion about the possibility of the Inspectorate holding an outreach event for local authorities in the local area. The applicant agreed to take soundings from the relevant authorities about the level of interest in and timing of such an event. The Inspectorate advised that, depending on resource availability and the timing of the applicant's request for an EIA scoping opinion, it would endeavour to undertake a site visit in February/March 2016. The Inspectorate agreed to provide the applicant with some dates to enable arrangements to be taken forward.

Specific decisions / follow up required

- Link to the Inspectorate's pre-application prospectus:
<http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/application-process/pre-application-service-for-applicants/>
- The applicant to send the Inspectorate a copy of the final s35 qualifying request
- CSU to send the applicant information regarding the services CSU provide
- The Inspectorate to schedule regular teleconferences and face-to-face meetings with the applicant
- The Inspectorate to provide possible dates for a site visit in Feb/March 2016 to be combined with a tripartite meeting with Highways England.
- The applicant to use 16 December event to gauge the need among the Local Authorities and neighbouring authorities for an outreach event.