



Meeting note

File reference	BC030001
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	14 February 2020
Meeting with	IAMP LLP
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Meeting objectives	Project update meeting and review of draft documents
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Project update

The Applicant gave an overview on the history of the International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP) proposals. This included an explanation of how the Secretary of State's original Section 35 Direction from 2015 was revised in 2017 to allow part of IAMP – IAMP ONE – to come forward early through a planning permission to meet market demand. The revised Section 35 Direction issued by the Secretary of State in 2017 confirmed that the majority of IAMP – IAMP TWO – remains a project of national significance.

The Applicant confirmed that the proposed application for IAMP TWO is anticipated to be submitted in the Q3 2020.

The Applicant confirmed that a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) will be submitted as part of the application including details of the future management and monitoring of the Ecological and Landscape Management Area (ELMA). The Environmental Statement and HMP will together demonstrate how a net gain will be achieved.

The Applicant also confirmed that consideration has been given to the requirement of the Habitat Regulations and that documentation will be submitted to provide the competent authority with such information as may reasonably be required to determine whether an appropriate assessment is required in accordance with recent case law.

Draft documents

The Inspectorate reviewed the following draft documents provided in December 2019:

- Draft Development Consent Order
- Draft chapters of the Environmental Statement
- Explanatory Memorandum
- Consultation Report
- Works Plans and Land Plans
- Scheme Implementation Report
- Design Code
- Book of Reference
- Funding Statement
- Statement of Reasons
- HRA Screening Matrices

A brief discussion of the Inspectorate's comments on the draft documents was held. Detailed comments are provided in the Table below.

Electronic submission of application documents

The Inspectorate advised that it no longer requires a hard copy application at the point of submission. But advised the Applicant that hard copies of particular individual documents could still be requested at any point throughout the pre-examination and examination processes.

International Advanced Manufacturing Park 2 (IAMP 2) Project

PINS queries on draft Application documents – February 2020

These queries relate solely to matters raised by the drafting of the DCO, and not the merits of the proposal. They are limited by the time available for consideration and raised without prejudice to the acceptance or otherwise of the eventual application. They are provided to assist the preparation of the next iteration.

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
1.	General: Drafting		<p>The DCO should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the Statutory Instrument (SI) template • follow guidance and best practice for SI drafting (for example avoiding “shall/should”) in accordance with the latest version of guidance from the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel • follow best practice drafting guidance from the Planning Inspectorate and the Departments in Advice Note 15 – Drafting development consent orders (and see specific references to Advice Note 15 below) • fully audited to ensure that that there are no inconsistencies within the DCO and its constituent parts such as definitions or expressions in the articles, requirements, protective provisions, other schedules and any book of reference and/or any deemed marine licence, that all legislative references in the DCO are to extant provisions and all schedules refer to the correct articles.

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
2.	General: Precedents		<p>Notwithstanding that drafting precedent has been set by previous DCOs, full justification should be provided for each power/provision taking account of the facts of this particular DCO application.</p> <p>Where drafting precedents in previous made DCOs have been relied on, these should be checked to identify whether they have been subsequently refined or developed in the most recent DCOs so that the DCO provisions reflect the Secretary of State's current policy preferences. If any general provisions (other than works descriptions and other drafting bespoke to the facts of this particular application and DCO) actually differ in any way from corresponding provisions in the Secretary of State's most recent made DCOs, an explanation should be provided as to how and why they differ (including but not limited to changes to statutory provisions made by or related to the Housing and Planning Act 2016).</p>
3.	General: Novel drafting		<p>The purpose of and necessity for any provision which uses novel drafting, and which does not have precedent in a made DCO or similar statutory order should be explained. The drafting should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be unambiguous • achieve what the applicant wants it to achieve • be consistent with any definitions or expressions in other provisions of the DCO and the PA2008 power on which the provision is based should also be identified.

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
4.	General: Flexibility – as provided for example in the maintenance article and definition, definition of commencement, power to deviate, authorised development and requirements		<p>The extent of any flexibility provided by the DCO should be fully explained, such as the scope of maintenance works and ancillary works, limits of deviation and the ability (through tailpieces in requirements) of discharging authorities to authorise subsequent amendments.</p> <p>The preferred approach to limiting this flexibility is to limit the works (or amendments) to those that would not give rise to any <u>materially new or materially different</u> environmental effects to those identified in the environmental statement.</p> <p>The drafting which gives rise to an element of flexibility (or alternatives) should provide clearly for unforeseen circumstances and define the scope of what is being authorised with sufficient precision. For example, the Secretary of State had to amend article 6 (Benefit of Order) of The National Grid (Richborough Connection Project) Development Consent Order 2017 at decision stage to remove ambiguity (as later corrected by Richborough connection correction order)</p> <p>In relation to the flexibility to carry out advance works, any “carve out” from the definition of “commencement” should be fully justified and it should be demonstrated that such works are de minimis and do not have environmental impacts which would need to be controlled by requirement. See section 21 of Advice Note 15.</p> <p>The drafting of the requirements should reflect Advice Note 15, sections 17 and 19</p>

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
5.	General: Disapplication or amendment of legislation/statutory provisions		<p>The guidance in section 25 of Advice Note 15 should be followed and additional information sought such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the purpose of the legislation/statutory provision • the persons/body having the power being disappplied • an explanation as to the effect of disapplication and whether any protective provisions or requirements are required to prevent any adverse impact arising as a result of disapplying the legislative controls • (by reference to section 120 and schedule 5) how each disappplied provision constitutes a matter for which provision may be made in the DCO. <p>Where the consent falls within a schedule to the Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015 evidence will be required that the regulator has consented to removing the need for the consent.</p>
6.	Article 4: Development consent etc granted by the order	<p><i>4(1) Subject to the provisions of this Order, including the requirements in Schedule 2 (requirements), IAMP LLP is granted development consent for the authorised development within the Order limits and subject to the requirements.</i></p>	<p>Art 4(1): 'subject to requirements' is unnecessary, because this is addressed earlier in the article.</p>
		<p><i>4(2) Nothing in this Order prevents the carrying out of archaeological investigations (under requirement [X], investigations for the purpose of assessing ground conditions, remedial work in respect of any contamination or erection of any temporary means of enclosure and the temporary display of site notices or advertisement immediately upon this Order coming into force.</i></p>	<p>Art 4 (2): It would be more usual for this issue regarding pre-commencement works including archaeological investigations to be dealt with elsewhere in the DCO, and the applicant may want to consider whether 'archaeological investigations' should be included in the definition of 'commence', subject earlier comments regarding carve outs in 4 above.</p>

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
7.	Article 12: Temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets		<p>This a wide power -authorising (subject to street authority approval) stopping up, restriction and alteration of any street (regardless of whether the street is within the Order limits). There will need to be justification as to why this power is necessary, and consideration given as to whether or not it should be limited to identified streets.</p> <p>Notwithstanding other precedents, justification should be provided as to why the power is appropriate and proportionate having regard to the impacts on pedestrians and others of authorising temporary working sites in these streets.</p>
8.	Article 19: Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerow's		<p>The guidance in section 22 of Advice Note 15 should be followed. It is noted that as currently drafted, the article gives wide powers to fell, lop etc. any tree or shrub within or overhanging the Order limits.</p> <p>The Applicant should consider whether, as per Advice Note 15, the trees and hedgerows subject to these powers should be specified and identified on a plan and schedule. This would assist the ExA to examine in detail whether felling, lopping etc is justified.</p> <p>If it is not possible at this stage to specify which trees or hedgerows are to be affected, then any general power should be subject to later consent by the local authority.</p> <p>Is the Applicant intending to provide a Plan to provide definitive comfort on this Article or perhaps draw attention to some part of the ES?</p>
9.	Article 20: Compulsory Acquisition of land	General	These provisions (and any relevant plans) should be drafted in accordance with the guidance in Advice Note 15, sections 23 (extinguishment of rights) and 24 (restrictive covenants)
		<i>20(1) IAMP LLP may acquire compulsorily so much of the Order land as is required for the authorised development, or to facilitate it, or as is incidental to it.</i>	This should be tied to the land plans and book of reference e.g. 'as described in the book of reference and the land plans'

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
		20(2) This article is subject to article [22] (compulsory acquisition or rights), article 26 (acquisition of subsoil or airspace only) and article [29] (temporary use of land for constructing the authorised development).	<p>The Article refers to 'article [22] (compulsory acquisition or rights)'</p> <p>The Inspectorate would expect the final drafted application documents to cross-refer to correct Articles within the dDCO and be consistent with other application documents submitted e.g. Statement of Reasons.</p> <p>Is Compulsory Acquisition to be subject to any other articles in the DCO e.g. Art 24 (private rights)?</p>
10.	Article 23: Compulsory Acquisition of rights		<p>The Secretary of State DfT's decision (paragraph 62 of the M4 Motorway (Junctions 3 to 12) (Smart Motorway) DCO) should be noted: <i>"to remove the power to impose restrictive covenants and related provisions as he does not consider that it is appropriate to give such a general power over any of the Order land as defined in article 2(1) in the absence of a specific and clear justification for conferring such a wide-ranging power in the circumstances of the proposed development and without an indication of how the power would be used"</i>.</p> <p>Compulsory acquisition of land held <u>by</u> the Crown must not be authorised through this article. This could be achieved, for example by expressly excluding these interests in the book of reference or by excepting them from the definition of the Order land.</p>
11.	Article 33: Statutory Undertakers		<p>Where a representation is made by a statutory undertaker under section 127 of the Planning Act 2008 and has not been withdrawn, the Secretary of State will be unable to authorise powers relating to statutory undertaker land unless satisfied of specified matters set out in section 127. If the representation is not withdrawn by the end of the examination, confirmation will be needed that the "expedience" test is met.</p> <p>The Secretary of State will also be unable to authorise removal or repositioning of apparatus unless satisfied that the extinguishment or removal is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the development to which the order relates in accordance with section 138 of the Planning Act 2008. Justification will be needed to show that extinguishment or removal is necessary.</p>

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
12.	Article 36: Special Category Land		<p>If it is argued that special parliamentary procedure should not apply (before authorising compulsory acquisition of land or rights in land being special category land) full details should be provided to support the application of the relevant subsections in Section 131 or 132, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where it is argued that land will be no less advantageous when burdened with the order right, identifying specifically the persons in whom it is vested and other persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights, and clarifying the extent of public use of the land • where it is argued that any suitable open space land to be given in exchange is available only at prohibitive cost, identifying specifically those costs.
13.	Schedule 1, Works 5	<i>Work No. 5 – the provision of highway works to alter the existing highway and construct new highways, bridges and critical infrastructure including</i>	<p>Schedule 1 refers to Work No.5 and this is followed by Works 5A to 5F, however, there is no Work No.5 on the Works Plans.</p> <p>The DCO descriptions of works include what amount to nested works, where a power is given in one numbered work that is then elaborated upon in more detail in a subsequent numbered work. Preferably, for the avoidance of doubt, the works should be described as individual ‘packages’, avoiding the nesting of elements of other works.</p>
14.	Schedule 1, Works 5A	<i>Work No. 5A within the area of land shown on sheet 3 of the works plans and being the works to dual the existing A1290 and tie-in with the A19 at the Downhill Lane Junction, [the general arrangement of which is shown on the regulation 6(2) plan [Document [x]] including-</i>	<p>Upon review of the Works Plan, it appears that Works No.5A also appears on Sheet 3, 4 and 5 of 6. We would recommend that the Applicant review all application documents to ensure consistency across all documents.</p> <p>Should “including” be at the end of this Schedule?</p> <p>See Q.4 below on the Works Plan.</p>

Q No.	Article (A)/ Requirement (R)	Extract from DCO (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
15.	Schedule 1, Works 5B	Work No. 5B – within the area of land shown on sheet 3 of the works plans and being the construction of a new bridge over the A19 connecting the authorised development to Washington Road, raising [and realigning] the existing road level on Washington Road and the construction of estate roads connecting to Washington Road and the A1290 [the general arrangement of which is shown on the regulation 6(2) plan [Document [x]]].	Upon review of the Works Plan, it appears that Works No.5B also appears on Sheet 5 of 6. We would recommend that the Applicant review all application documents to ensure consistency across all documents. See Q.4 below on the Works Plan.
16.	Schedule 1		Upon review of the Works Plan, it appears that Works No.5D as depicted on Sheet 5 of 6, is not described within Schedule 1. We would recommend that the Applicant review all application documents to ensure consistency across all documents. See Q.5 below on the Works Plan.
17.	Schedule 1, Works 6A and 6B	Work No. 6a – as shown on sheets 2 and 5 of the works plans being the construction of two foul water pumping stations. Work No. 6b – as shown on sheet 1 of the works plans being the construction of a primary electricity substation.	Upon review of the Works Plan, specifically Sheets 1, 2 and 5, as reflected in these Schedules it should be noted that these Sheets refer to Works No.6 and not Works 6a and 6b. Should the dDCO be amended to reflect a single Works or should the Works Plan be amended as per the dDCO. See Q.6 below on the Works Plan.
18.	Schedule 2, Part 2: Procedures for discharge of requirements		Advice Note 15 provides standard drafting for articles dealing with discharge of requirements. It is recommended that the Applicant reviews this advice when preparing the final draft of the DCO, and if this guidance isn't followed then justification should be provided as to why this is the case.

Explanatory Memorandum (EM)		
Q No.	Extract from EM	Question/Comments
1.	General	The Explanatory Memorandum ('EM') should state whether the article replicates a model provision or precedent article. It would also be helpful if the EM clarified whether the change is minor and has been made where in the applicant's view the model provision/precedent is unclear or does not follow standard statutory instrument drafting practice. Where a model provision or precedent article is substantially changed, the EM should clearly explain how that alters the effect. Ideally (and particularly if an article is novel), the power on which each article is based should be identified. The applicant will also need to justify why the use of this precedent is appropriate for this particular development.
2.	General	The Applicant's note of 16.01.20, explains that there are to be some novel provisions added to the DCO. The EM will need to be updated to include an explanation and justification of their inclusion in the updated DCO.
3.	Reference to flexibility	The EM makes a number of references to the need for flexibility. The EM should explain why the flexibility is justified in relation to the circumstances of the project and the relevant article in the DCO. See also comment number 4 above.
4.	Paragraph 5.12	The unpopulated table appears to be superfluous, because the effects of the disapplication of the various legislation is explained in 5.13- 5.16. That said, including these in a table format might make navigation easier so we would not discourage the applicant from using tables in the EM when appropriate.
5.	Paragraph 6.8	'It is in the public interest and has precedent in Transport and Works Act Orders'. The footnote only provides one example. If the justification is based on the approach being more widely used, details of other orders should be given.

Draft ES and DCO			
Q No.	Paragraph/Section	Extract from [abbreviation of doc] (for ease of reference)	Question/Comments
1.	Draft DCO Part 1 (5)	Parameters of authorised development – limits of deviation	The Inspectorate has not reviewed the Parameter plans and thus cannot comment on limits of deviation. However, The Inspectorate recommends that the Applicant be mindful of the principles established in Advice note nine: Rochdale Envelope . The EIA should assess the worst case that could be permitted by the draft DCO.

2.	Draft DCO Part 1 (19)	Powers of felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows	The Inspectorate notes this provision. It is recommended that the Applicant considers whether the powers granted by this provision may conflict with ecological or landscape mitigation measures assessed in the ES.
3.	ES- Table C1	Relationship with Neighbouring developments and Nationally Significant Infrastructure projects	The Inspectorate notes the potential overlap between the construction phase of the Proposed Development and other developments, including two NSIPs. The ES should clarify the relationship between the projects, including potential conflicts. The ES should clearly identify the worst-case scenario and cumulative effects in the relevant technical assessments, where necessary.
4.	ES – paragraph C4.1.1	Habitat Management Plan (HMP)	The Inspectorate notes that the draft DCO does not currently contain provision to discharge requirements. Thus it is unclear how the HMP will be secured in its final version and which parties will be involved. The Applicant should demonstrate how the measures in the HMP would be secured to ensure that the Inspectorate has sufficient certainty to draw a reasoned conclusion regarding likely significant effects.
5.	ES – paragraph C4.1.3	Flexibility of Parameter Plans	The Inspectorate does not have a draft version of the Parameter Plans. Refer to comment 1 above regarding the Rochdale envelope.
6.	ES- Table C2	Key Plans used to inform the ES	The majority of the Key Plans were not provided at this stage but it is noted that many plans are described in Table C2 as illustrative. The Applicant should be mindful that enough details should be provided to inform a reasoned conclusion.
7.	ES- paragraphs C4.2.6 to C4.2.15	Detailed infrastructure works – Works No5A, 5B and 5C	It is noted that the description of the Works No 5A, 5B & 5C at paragraphs C4.2.6 to C4.2.15 contains details of the proposed infrastructures dimensions that are not included in the draft DCO (Schedule 1- Authorised Development). As the Inspectorate has not reviewed the Parameter Plans at this stage, it is unclear whether the DCO would allow for the construction of elements those parameters have not been correctly assessed in the ES. The Applicant should ensure that the parameters secured in the DCO are consistent with those assessed in the ES.

8.	ES-paragraphs C4.2.26 to C4.2.30	Drainage Strategy (Work No. 5)	Is this heading using the correct referencing? It is noted that drainage infrastructure (including swales and drains) are not included in the description of Work No 5 in the draft DCO (Schedule 1- Authorised Development) but listed as ancillary works.
9.	ES-paragraph C4.2.51	ELMA's objectives	The Inspectorate notes that the works to the ELMA and that the management of the ecological area will be carried out in accordance with the HMP (See draft DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 6). The Planning Inspectorate notes that the draft DCO does not currently contain provision to discharge requirements. The DCO should include mechanisms to secure the delivery of the HMP.
10.	ES-paragraph C4.2.56	Public transport Strategy, drainage schemes and Waste Management plan	The Inspectorate notes that the draft DCO does not currently contain provision to discharge requirements. The DCO should include mechanisms to secure the delivery of these Plans.
11.	ES-paragraph C4.2.60	Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)	As above.
12.	HRA Screening matrices	HRA Screening Matrix 1 (Durham Coast Special Area of Conservation) and Screening Matrix 2 (Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area and Ramsar)	The Inspectorate notes the submission of HRA screening matrices but has not seen a No Significant Effects Report (NSER) or a Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (HRA Report). The matrices indicated that no Likely Significant Effects (LSE) on European Protected sites are anticipated from the Proposed Development either alone or in combination. The Applicant is reminded that NSER or HRA Report should provide the reasoning and evidence behind its conclusions in line with Advice Note Ten: Habitat Regulations Assessment relevant to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. The matrices should not duplicate the information included in the NSER or HRA Report but should include explicit cross references to evidence in the applicant's information for each qualifying feature of the European sites considered. When cross referencing to evidence to support the conclusions, the specific document, paragraph number and page reference should be provided.

Consultation Report (CR)		
Q No.	Extract from CR	Question/Comments
1.	Executive Summary	It may be beneficial to explain in full what "IAMP" pre-2017 was, in para 2.7 of the report the Applicant makes clear: <i>Between November 2016 and January 2017, the Applicant undertook non-statutory consultation on the Project, when it was the entirety of IAMP (that is both IAMP ONE and IAMP TWO)</i> Some similar text within the Executive summary may assist the reader.
2.	Chapter 3	Be mindful of s55 checklist, Box 24 <i>has the Applicant had regard to statutory guidance 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process'?</i> and Box 33 <i>Has the applicant had regard to DCLG guidance 'Planning Act 2008: Application form guidance'</i>
3.	Chapter 9	May be beneficial to include an Appendix or Table outlining Applicant's statutory duties under s49. Note no Tables/Appendices reflected for this particular chapter
4.	Para 1.10 <i>The extent of the Proposed Development is shown on Figure [XX],</i>	It is anticipated that the CR will be updated accordingly and corrected in the application version.
5.	Para 1.16 and Table 1.1	Refers to AN14, we would encourage the applicant to review the s55 checklist particular Box 24 and 33.
6.	Table 1.2	See comments above, point 4. It is anticipated that this table will be corrected in the application version.
7.	General	Use consistent abbreviation and language across suite of documents e.g. The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) or the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (SoS); National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) or National Networks for National Policy Statement (NNNPS). These are only a few of the inconsistencies identified and the Applicant may wish to undertake a thorough check of ALL application documents to ensure consistent approach.
8.	Para 2.14 <i>The Testos improvements has secured DCO approval and is currently being constructed. Downhill Lane junction improvements is currently progressing through Examination.</i>	Based on Applicant's current submission date, A19 downhill Lane, would be progressing through Recommendation.
9.	Para 2.16 <i>The website content was live from 12.01 midnight on the first day of consultation.</i>	Is this in reference to 1 st Consultation for IAMP (entirety) or IAMP 2?
10.	Para 3.5 - <i>IAMP LLP proposes to submit an application to the SoS under section 37 of the</i>	Application is due 2020, the Applicant may wish to undertake a thorough check of ALL application documents to ensure consistent approach.

	<i>Planning Act 2008, seeking a DCO for the Proposed Development, in 2019.</i>	
11.	Para 3.6 - <i>PINS is responsible for examining the application and making a recommendation to the relevant SoS...</i>	The appointed Examining Authority (single/panel) is responsible for examining the application and making a recommendation.
12.	Table 3.2 – Section 46 Duty to Consult	Column 3 refers to section 9 of the Report, this Chapter deals with response to consultation, is this correct? The Applicant may wish to undertake a thorough check of draft CR to ensure consistent approach.
13.	Para 4.8	Zones A and B are defined, however is there a map or illustrative plan which could assist in making it clear the extent of these zones?
14.	Para 5.21	Without site of the notice or SoCC, we assume that notice also states end date SoCC will be available at deposit locations? Considering s47 consultation started March 2019
15.	Para 5.24 to 5.26	Reference is made to STC and SCC being notified of change to consultation contact details, were any other parties notified, if so which parties?
16.	<p>"Inconsistencies with the SoCC"</p> <p>Para 5.27 - <i>There were, however [XX] minor departures from the published SoCC in terms of</i></p>	<p>Would it not be more accurate to state "Departures from the SoCC" When were these decisions made to depart from SoCC and were these decisions discussed with the relevant LAs to get their comments/views?</p> <p>The insertion of [xx] implies that there may be more than three departures from the agreed SoCC, is this the case?</p>
17.	Para 5.32	Without sight of the draft and final SoCC, its unclear what was agreed with the relevant LA's in terms of social media consultation. Was it agreed or discussed with relevant LAs that social media would no longer be a resource for consultation?
18.	Para 6.51	Provides an outline of what will be included within this section, the Applicant is reminded to reflect on s49 of PA2008 and therefore may wish to cross-refer to Section 9 of CR or relevant section that will outline where the Applicant had regard to responses (if any)?
19.	Table 6.3 Compliance withthe updated SoCC	<p>Should the title not be "...Final SoCC" updated implies there was a version earlier associated to the consultation on IAMP2, however the previous SoCC produced was for the consultation on the combined IAMP1 and 2 project. This is the Inspectorates understanding following review of the CR?</p> <p>It is noted in the table that the Applicant applies '\√' on most of the requirements of s47 and in some instances state "complete", is the Inspectorate to assume that '\√' also represents "complete" or does it have a separate meaning?</p>

20.	Table 7.1	The table identifies the LAs not previously consulted, we also assume the two LAs not previously consulted were included in the Applicants statutory s42 consultation (Appendix X.X not available to verify this) undertaken in 2019, however does the Applicant provide reasons as to why they previously were not consulted?
21.	Para 7.21 - <i>A consultation letter along with a suite of enclosed documentation (summarised in Table [X.X] below) was sent to the Section 42 Consultees</i>	We assume this is referencing Table 7.2?
22.	Para 7.22 - <i>Slightly different consultation letters were sent to the Section 42(d) consultees, in terms of the consultation documentation that was included within the letter. This is summarised in Table [X.X] below</i>	Para 7.21 implies that "a consultation letter" was sent to all s42 consultees, however para 7.22 contradicts this statement by implying a separate letter was issued specifically for s42 (d) consultees and they either received additional or less documentation. It is unclear as to what was issued to s42(d) consultees as Table 7.2 (the Inspectorate assumes this is the table being referenced) does not identify any s42(d) consultees and the Inspectorate has not had sight of the letter that was issued.
23.	Table 7.2	If s42(d) consultees did receive additional documentation, this table does not identify these documents. Section 7 of the CR also doesn't provide a clear explanation as to why some s42 consultees received additional/less documentation on the proposed development.
24.	Para 7.24 - <i>All Section 42 consultation letters also advised that hard copies of all consultation material is available for inspection at the public exhibition venues (as identified in Section 8.0 above)</i>	Section 8.0? The Applicant is encouraged to undertake a full review of the CR and provide accurate references to sections and/or other application documents upon submission of the final report.
25.	Para 7.50	Provides an outline of what will be included within this section, the Applicant is reminded to reflect on s49 of PA2008 and therefore may wish to cross-refer to Section 9 of CR or relevant section that will outline where the Applicant had regard to responses (if any)?
26.	Para 7.51	The Applicant is reminded to review the s55 checklist and ensure they have complied with matters addressed within the checklist pertaining to s42 consultation.
27.	Section 9 and 11	The Inspectorate notes the Applicant's intention for this section and would advice that when completing that it is clear the applicant addresses where they had regard to responses. It would be useful if this was split where possible per consultation undertaken i.e. s42, 47, 48 etc and in a format that is easy to understand i.e. set out how the Applicant had regard with a supporting Table and/or appendix if this assist in clarifying the Applicants duties.

Works Plan		
Q No.	Sheet	Question/Comments
1.	Key Plan	Would it not be preferable to run the sheets in Order from North to South i.e. Sheet 2 be renamed to Sheet 1 and Sheet 1 be renamed to Sheet 2?
2.	Sheet 2	Reflects 'Cut Line', should this not reflect Sheet 1 and 3? However please note comment 1 above.
3.	Sheet 1, 3, 4 & 5 of 6	The Limits of Deviation as depicted on these sheets, refer to " <i>Limit of Deviation for numbered Works 1, 2 and 3</i> ". The key 'line' isn't very clear on these Work Plans. Should the Limit of Deviation not be associated to Works 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5D and 5F?
4.	Sheet 5	The Key within the legend annotates Works No.5A as purple, however the Works Plan depicts this as Work No.1, the Inspectorate believes this should be Works No.5A. The Applicant is reminded to ensure that all application documents are consistent. See comment above at Item 14 on the dDCO. Works No.5B isn't reflected on this Sheet. See comments above at Q.15 on the dDCO.
5.	Sheet 5	Works No.5D is reflected on Sheet 5 of 6, please see comments above at Q.16 on the dDCO.
6.	Sheets 1, 3 & 5	These Sheets refer to Works No.6 and the legend annotates the blue as Utilities. Schedule 1 doesn't refer to a single Works but Works No.6a and 6b. Works No.6a as per the schedule refers to " <i>the construction of two foul water pumping stations.</i> ", whilst Works No.6b as per the schedule refers to " <i>the construction of a primary electricity substation.</i> " Should the Works Plan be amended to reflect Works No.6a & 6b OF Schedule 1 of the dDCO or should the dDCO be amended as per the Works Plan? See comments above at Q.17 on the dDCO.

Land Plans		
Q No.	Sheet	Question/Comments
1.	Key Plan	Would it not be preferable to run the sheets in Order from North to South i.e. Sheet 2 be renamed to Sheet 1 and Sheet 1 be renamed to Sheet 2?
2.	General	Upon review of the Land Plan there appears to be numerous plots, with no distinguishable numbering system. The Inspectorate found it incredibly hard to identify specific plots, particular when undertaking a review of these Plots against those listed in the BoR.

		<p>The common practice taken for ease of reference regarding plots on Land Plans is typically 1/xx, where 1 reflects the Sheet Number associated to the Land Plan, whilst xx reflects the plot number. This co-ordination of plots makes them easily identifiable especially when referenced within the BoR in terms of users knowing, which sheet they should refer to for a specific plot.</p> <p>At present there appear to be over 800 plots, however its is not easy to find these plots.</p>
3.	Sheets 1 to 6	The Inset on each of these Plans reflects the Key Plan. On the Works Plan this particular inset reflect the specific sheet being reviewed, which was useful on the Works Plan.
4.	Sheet 1 & 2 of 6	It is unclear where Plot 41 ends and 35 starts, there is no clear redline distinguishing these two plots.
5.	Sheet 6	There are numerous plots identified in close proximity to plots 855 and 801, which don't appear to have plot numbers. The Applicant is encouraged to ensure that the final application documents submitted for Acceptance is consistent across all documents and completed to a satisfactory standard.

General

1. Use consistent abbreviation and language across suite of documents e.g. Development Consent Order (DCO) or ("the Order"). These are only a few of the inconsistencies identified and the Applicant may wish to undertake a thorough check of ALL application documents to ensure consistent approach.
2. In some documents reference is made to the "Development Consent Order 2017", good practice suggest either using reference to Title of documents as "Development Consent Order 20[]" and within the content of the document referencing as the "Development Consent Order".
3. The Inspectorate would expect that Appendix 1 of the Statement of Reasons include all Works associated to the development and we assume that the blanks will be completed accordingly.
4. The Applicant is reminded to consider the [Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land](#), in particular Annex D: Book of Reference. Paragraph 10 states: *Where it is proposed to create and acquire new rights compulsorily, they should be clearly identified. The book of reference should also cross-refer to the relevant articles contained in the development consent order.* The Applicant may wish to review the BoR submitted by the Applicant for the [A19 Downhill Lane Junction Improvement scheme](#) and take note of the Inspectorates comments provided above at Q.2 on the Land Plans, regarding plot references.
5. Only the Works Plans and Land Plans have been submitted for comments. The Inspectorate would recommend that in the absence of a Parameters Plans, that the Applicant ensure that all application documents are cross-referenced for consistency. Schedule 1 of the dDCO makes reference to Development Parcels S1 to S5 being associated to Works 2, please ensure that final submissions of application documents are consistent.
6. Schedule 1 refers to Work No.5 and this is followed by Works 5A to 5F, however, there is no Work No.5 on the Works Plans. See comment above at Q.13 on the dDCO, should the Works Plan reflect a Works No.5?