

Meeting Note

File reference	EN010024 – Navitus Bay Wind Park
Status	Final
Author	Owain George

Meeting with	Local Authorities & Developer
Meeting date	09/11/2011
Attendees (IPC)	Robert Upton (Pre-Application Commissioner) Susannah Guest (Case Leader) Owain George (Case Officer)
Attendees (non IPC)	Alan Davies (Purbeck DC) Bridget Downton (Purbeck DC) J Wheeler (Dorset CC) Don M Gobbett (Dorset CC) Sam Fox-Adams (Dorset CC) Steve Duckett (East Dorset DC) Anna Budge (New Forest DC) Phil Salmon (Isle of Wight CC) Richard Read (Hampshire CC) Toby Ayling (Hampshire CC) Rob Ainslie (New Forest NPA) G Moir (Christchurch BC) Rebecca Landman (Borough of Poole) Steve Davies (Bournemouth BC) Rebecca Evens (Eneco) Helen Cassini (Eneco)
Location	East Dorset District Council Offices

Meeting purpose	Inception Meeting
------------------------	-------------------

Summary of key points discussed and advice given	<p>IPC provided a presentation on the Planning Act 2008 application process. The IPC explained its openness policy and that it was unable to provide advice on the merits of a proposal. The presentation (attached to this meeting note) included information on the future of the IPC within the context of the Localism Bill.</p> <p>A discussion surrounding the role and involvement of Local Authorities in the Planning Act 2008 process was held. The IPC advised that under the Planning Act 2008, local authorities are identified as Consultation Bodies in accordance with the criteria under Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008. The local authorities (including District and County Councils and National Park Authorities) where an NSIP is based are known as the 'B' local authorities, while 'A' local authorities are those that share a boundary with a 'B' authority.</p>
---	--

IPC said that definitive identification of B authorities could only come when the applicant had made final decisions on routes and sites.

IPC identified the roles and responsibilities of the Local Authorities in both the pre-application process and during acceptance and examination of the stages.

IPC advised that the production of a Draft Development Consent Order is the responsibility of the applicant and is required to be submitted as part of the formal application submission.

IPC clarified that the content of an LIR is not linked with whether an authority is an A or B authority, but purely on a factual and evidence-based review of what the impacts of the proposal would be in the authority. New Forest District Council noted that for another Nationally Significant Infrastructure Proposal they had introduced the idea of a 'positive, neutral, negative' analysis of impacts to their members at an early stage and were continuing to work well on this basis.

Should an elected member wish to make a representation in an individual capacity, they could register at Pre-examination stage as an interested party. They should ensure that they identify that the relevant representation is made on their behalf and not on behalf of the authority.

In terms of Adequacy of Consultation representation, given that the deadline would be 14 days after receipt: dialogue with developer, review of IPC website and if possible monitoring of the consultation set out in the SoCC could make this a less onerous task in the time provided.

Hampshire CC questioned the responsibilities for discharging requirements. IPC advised that it would be a matter for the DCO to specify the appropriate Authority, and that this could be county, unitary or district as appropriate.

IPC recommended that discussions relating to any Section 106 agreements should take place during pre-application discussions with the developer. Heads of terms should be in place prior to the submission of the application and the Examining Authority is likely to request completed agreements during the examination of an application. The IPC noted that it was possible for s.106 agreements to be discussed on a contingent basis even if the authority was opposed to a proposal.

IPC clarified that requirements (or conditions) could relate to development that was considered off-site or associated development under the terms of the Planning Act 2008.

	<p>IPC recommended that Local Authorities consider schemes of delegation and their own processes for submitting information to the IPC during the application process. It was also recommended that Authorities communicate information on the IPC process to its Members and consider the need for any further outreach work from the IPC.</p> <p>IPC addressed questions surrounding joint working and noted that this is entirely to the discretion of each Local Authority.</p> <p>IPC noted its pre-application outreach events in respect of informing local communities about the Planning Act 2008 regime and the role of the IPC. Dependent on resources and demand, IPC usually looked to run such events towards the end of a developer's pre-application consultation programme</p> <p>Eneco advised that it would keep all parties informed of any progress with the application. Eneco also confirmed that the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) was published in the press on 9 November 2011.</p>
--	--

Specific decisions/ follow up required?	IPC recommended that all parties follow the progress of the application on the Commission's website.
--	--

Circulation List	All Attendees