

# IPC Infrastructure Planning Commission

## Stakeholder Meeting Note

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Author</b>                     | <b>Nik Perepelov</b>   |
| <b>Meeting with</b>               | <b>Various Stakeholders in relation to proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects in the North East of England</b>  |
| <b>Meeting date</b>               | <b>23<sup>rd</sup> September 2010</b>  |
| <b>Attendees (IPC)</b>            | <b>David Cliff (Case Leader)<br/>Gideon Amos (Commissioner)<br/>Kath Haddrell (Case Leader)<br/>Nik Perepelov (Assistant Case Officer)</b>   |
| <b>Attendees (non IPC)</b>        | <b>Various, please follow the link for list of attendees:<br/><a href="http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/100927_EN010023_IPC-Outreach-event-attendees.pdf">http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/100927_EN010023_IPC-Outreach-event-attendees.pdf</a></b>  |
| <b>Location</b>                   | <b>North Tyneside Council Offices</b>  |
| <b>Meeting purpose</b>            | IPC Outreach event   |
| <b>Summary of outcomes</b>        | David Cliff gave the following presentation outlining the procedures relating to the Infrastructure Planning Development Consent application process and, in particular, the opportunities for stakeholders to become involved in the process:<br><a href="http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Sep-v2.pdf">http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Sep-v2.pdf</a>  |
| <b>Record of any advice given</b> | The presentation was followed by a Q&A session, where the following advice was given: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Applicants are not required by the Regulations to send individual letters to local residents informing them of an application's acceptance. The Commission encourages applicants to think carefully about going beyond the minimum requirements for publicity and notification set out in the Act and regulations.</li> <li>2. The current fee regime does not make provision for any fees to be paid to Local Authorities. Where extra resources may be needed, Local Authorities and promoters may wish to consider entering into</li> </ol> |

Planning Performance Agreements.

3. The IPC will accept hard copies and electronic copies of relevant representation forms (registration forms). Local authorities ought to make the IPC aware if they feel that low levels of access to the internet in a particular area will require a large volume of paper forms to be sent. We are able to accommodate particular needs if we are made aware of them, but lack the detailed local knowledge, so would look for a steer from the Local Authorities.
4. The Planning Act 2008 sets strict deadlines for each stage of the process. Moreover, the examinations will be inquisitorial rather than adversarial in nature. Finally, National Policy Statements will provide a clear policy basis for decisions. As such, the regime will avoid the expensive and lengthy legal arguments of previous inquiries for comparable schemes.
5. The thresholds for a project being considered a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (“NSIP”) are set out in sections 15-30 of the Planning Act 2008.
6. There is no mechanism for decisions to be appealed, though there is a six week window after a decision is made for a legal challenge. Limited amendments and revocations may be made after consent has been granted, though the procedural details are not yet published and it is not expected that these would amount to significant material changes to a scheme.
7. Sustainability is a material consideration for the examining authority to the extent that it features in the relevant National Policy Statement (Section 10 of the Planning Act requires that in drafting an NPS, the Secretary of State “must [...] do so with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development”). Moreover, the Commissioner or Panel must, under section 105(2) have regard to any matter which they think are important and relevant to a scheme.
8. The Commission would expect the heads of terms of any “s106” agreements to be agreed and submitted to the IPC at the same time as the application for development consent. Therefore, as with draft requirements (conditions), these need careful consideration with the relevant consultees prior to the submission of a formal application for development consent.

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Specific decisions/follow up required?</b> | Not applicable |
|---|----------------|

|                             |                  |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| <b>IPC Circulation List</b> | <b>Attendees</b> |
|-----------------------------|------------------|