

Application by Highways England for an order granting development consent for the proposed M20 Junction 10a (TR010006)

Administrative arrangements, agendas and process information for the Examination hearings taking place in w/c 20 February 2017

On 23 January 2017 notification was sent to Interested Parties about the hearings that will take place in w/c 20 February 2017 at the **Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce, Ashford Business Point, Waterbrook Avenue, Sevington, Ashford, TN24 0LH**.

This document sets out the administrative arrangements, agendas and process information for each of these hearings. Please navigate using the table below:

Hearing	Page
Issue Specific Hearing dealing with matters relating to the environment	2 to 14
Compulsory Acquisition Hearing	15
Issue Specific Hearing dealing with matters relating to the draft Development Consent Order	16
Open Floor Hearing	17

If you did not do so by the pre-notified deadline, it is now vital for Interested Parties intending to attend any of these hearings to give prior notice to the case team of who will attend, who will speak and which points they wish to address. In accordance with Rule 14(3) of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended), any oral representations should be based on representations previously made in writing by the particular participant.

Please provide your Interested Party reference number in any communication and mark it for the attention of the M20 Junction 10a case team.

Email. M20Junction10A@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Issue Specific Hearing dealing with matters relating to the environment,
10:00am Wednesday 22 February 2017**

Administrative arrangements

The hearing room will be available from 9:30am, and the hearing will commence at 10:00am. It is expected to close by about 5:00pm. There will be a break for lunch from approximately 1:00pm until 2:00pm. There will be mid-session comfort breaks at appropriate points throughout the day.

Hearing process and agenda

The hearing will follow the headings used in the ExA's first written questions (FWQs) (PD-008). A lot of documentation has been produced since the FWQs, so under each agenda item the ExA will invite a brief statement of the current position from the identified Interested Party – the Applicant (Highways England); the two local authorities (Ashford Borough Council and Kent County Council); any relevant Statutory Parties; and any other Interested Parties.

The purpose of the hearing will be to identify matters agreed, matters not agreed and discussions ongoing. The ExA will ask questions as necessary.

In order to ensure that those attending the hearing can make the best use of the time, the Examining Authority (ExA) has prepared the agenda below.

A. The Proposed Scheme

1. **Design of the Scheme.** The sub-points below relate to the ExA's FWQ Q2.2 (PD-008) and the Applicant's response at Deadline 3 (REP3-035):
 - i. **Statutory Undertakers' diversions.** Do any of the Statutory Undertakers and telecommunications service providers which have not yet responded have a response to FWQ Q2.2 ii., which asks whether they are content with the diversions proposed for the services for which they are responsible?
 - ii. **Southern Water pumping station.** The Applicant states that drawings (ES Fig 2.1 and Works Plans) will be "*submitted in due course*". Would the Applicant state when they will be submitted to the Examination?
 - iii. **UK Power Networks apparatus.** The Applicant states that drawings will be "*submitted in due course*". Would the Applicant state when they will be submitted to the Examination?
2. **Presence and use of construction compounds.** This relates to ExA's FWQ Q2.4 iv (PD-008) and the Applicant's response at Deadline 3 (REP3-035):
 - i. The Applicant states that "*This needs further discussion with ABC [Ashford Borough Council]/KCC [Kent County Council] and will be addressed as part of the SoCG process*". Would the Applicant and ABC/ KCC state the current status with regard to the presence and use of the construction compounds and the mechanism for securing them in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)?
3. **Public Right of Way (PRoW) diversions.** This relates to ExA's FWQ Q2.4 v. (PD-008) and the Applicant's response at Deadline 3 (REP3-035):
 - i. Would ABC and KCC state whether they are content with the PRoW diversions?

B. Transport Assessment

1. **Rat Running.** A number of Interested Parties (IP) (eg Paul Bartlett (REP3-029), The Village Alliance (REP3-034)) have expressed the view that "*rat runs*" should be closed.
 - i. What is the Applicant's positioning on the issue of "*rat running*", ie the process of drivers trying to find alternative routes when there are problems at the motorway junctions?
 - ii. What are the IPs' responses to the Applicant's response at Deadline 4 (REP4-020) to their various Written Representations (WR) on this subject submitted at Deadline 3?

2. **Safety on Northbound M20.** What is The Village Alliance's response to the Applicant's position on the issue of the safety of the northbound M20 where there is a bend in the motorway (REP4-020, item 034.05), which was a matter of some concern to the Village Alliance in its WR (REP3-034)?
3. **Barrey Road exit onto the A2070.** What is the IPs' response on the Applicant's position regarding the Barrey Road exit onto the A2070 (e. REP4-020, items 029.06, 034.02 and 039.07; REP4-019, item 023.02), that the approach proposed by IPs to signalise the junction is outside the scheme?
4. **Kingsford Street.** What is the Village Alliance's response to the Applicant's proposals for Kingsford Street (REP4-020, item 034.03)?
5. **Local Issues, the A2070 Roundabout and Traffic Modelling.** What is the North Willlesborough Community Forum's (NWCF) response on the Applicant's position regarding NWCF's assertions:
 - i. on the local issues - that the scheme benefits long-distance travellers at the expense of local road users (REP4-020, item 039.01);
 - ii. on the design of the A2070 Roundabout - that the design should be re-visited (REP4-020, item 039.03); and
 - iii. on local traffic modelling - that traffic modelling figures and processes, upon which much of the justification for the scheme hangs, are flawed (REP4-020, item 039.04).
6. **Traffic Modelling and Uncertainties.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q19.1 to 19.77 (PD-008) and the Applicant's responses in its report 10.10 (REP3-019):
 - i. Would the Applicant summarise and quantify the uncertainties in the traffic modelling?
 - ii. Can the Applicant identify worst case scenarios relative to the core scenario for the receptors most affected by traffic volumes?

C. Air Quality

1. **Impact on Air Quality Modelling of ClientEarth High Court Judgment.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q5.1 i. (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035), the Applicant appears to place a lot of reliance on Interim Advice Note (IAN) 170/12v3 to correct for the impacts of Euro 6 vehicles.
 - i. Do IPs have any views on this?
2. **ClientEarth High Court Judgment's Effect on Compliance.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q5.1 ii. (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035), the Applicant states that "*any revisions to the PCM (Pollution Climate*

Mapping) modelling is highly unlikely to trigger para 5.13 of the National Policy Statement National Networks (NNNPS)“:

- i. In advance of revisions from Defra to its Pollution Climate Mapping modelling, does the Applicant have any evidence or justification for this statement?
3. **Study Area and Scope of Assessment.** Responses from ABC and the Applicant (REP3-004 and REP3-035, respectively) to ExA’s FWQ Q5.2 i. (PD-008) seem to be at variance:
 - i. Would the Applicant and ABC please state what (if any) areas are not agreed?
4. **Use of IAN 174/13.** Re. ABC’s WR (REP3-001) and the ExA’s FWQ Q5.2 (PD-008):
 - i. Would the Applicant explain why IAN 174/13 (dated June 2013) has not been updated to reflect recent Environmental Protection UK (EPUK)/ Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance, which advocates a more precautionary approach to the assessment of significance and is thought by many to be representative of the views of air quality professionals?
5. **Worst Case Scenarios for Air Quality and Health.** Building on Transport Assessment Q6 ii. above:
 - i. Can the Applicant identify the effect of worst case traffic forecast scenarios on the air quality assessments at the receptors most affected?
6. **Air Quality Monitoring During Operations.** Re. the ExA’s FWQ Q5.5 i. and ii. (PD-008) and the Applicant’s response (REP3-035):
 - i. Would the Applicant detail the “*existing monitoring collected by Ashford Borough Council*”?
 - ii. Would the Applicant state how its Post Opening Project Evaluation (POPE) assessment would review the scheme’s performance with regard to air quality, and how it would be secured in the dDCO?
 - iii. Would the Applicant expand on its response to the ExA’s FWQs Q5.5, what is the Applicant’s response to ABC (REP3-001), Public Health England (REP3-038) and others, which recommend monitoring of air quality during operations to verify the conclusions reached in the air quality assessment?
 - iv. Would the Applicant accept an additional Requirement in the dDCO for air quality monitoring with mitigation as necessary, similar to that used for the M4 J3-12 Smart Motorway DCO?
7. **Construction Traffic Movements.** Re. ABC’s WR (REP3-001) and the Applicant’s response (REP4-018), would the Applicant and ABC state their current positions with regard to the significance of construction traffic movements?

D. Cultural Heritage

1. **St Mary's Church Sevington, Court Lodge Farm and Barn.** A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Applicant and Historic England was submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-005), in which it appears that the combined and cumulative effects of the proposed development and the Stour Park development is now the main issue not agreed between the two parties. Historic England considers that the combined and cumulative effects on the setting of St Mary's Church and the Court Lodge and Barn are greater than acknowledged in the Applicant's Environmental Statement (ES):
 - i. Would Historic England indicate what additional information (if any) it requires in relation to the assessment of combined and cumulative effects of the proposed development and the Stour Park development?
 - ii. Can the Applicant and Historic England discuss and agree a way forward in this regard, and report back to the Examination for Deadline 5?
 - iii. Do KCC and ABC have any comments in relation to this matter?
2. **Archaeological Surveys.** The Councils in their joint Local Impact Report (LIR) (REP3-005) consider that on-site archaeological surveys are insufficient at present, and KCC has also proposed amended wording for Requirement 8 (Archaeology) in the dDCO:
 - i. Does the Applicant agree with the call for amended wording to Requirement 8, and if so when does the Applicant expect to agree suitable wording with KCC?
 - ii. Re. the ExA's FWQ Q6.2 (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035), the Applicant states that a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the intrusive archaeological evaluation of the scheme area is currently being produced, to be issued to KCC, and that the information will be reflected in the SoCG. Would the Applicant state the anticipated date of submission of the WSI and SoCG to the Examination, with any necessary securing measures for the dDCO?

E. Landscape

1. **Compensatory Tree Planting.** In the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Unit's (KDU) WR submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-026), KDU asked for compensatory tree planting along the east side of the realigned A20, to screen views from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and additional tree planting along the south-west side of the new link road to the A2070, to assist with screening the Stour Park Development from the AONB. The Applicant's response at Deadline 4

(REP4-020) states that opportunities for further specimen tree planting extending along the A20 would be explored during the detailed design stage. The Applicant has also stated that tree planting to screen the visual impact of the Stour Park Development from the AONB is outside of the control and scope of Highways England.

- i. What is the response of the KDU to the Applicant's response at Deadline 4 (REP4-020), in which the Applicant states that opportunities for further specimen tree planting extending along the A20 would be explored during the detailed design stage?
 - ii. To address the concerns of the KDU, could the Applicant suggest a suitable means of discussing and agreeing the planting strategy for the A20 with the KDU, and securing this commitment through the dDCO?
2. **Trees under Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).** ABC pointed out in its WR (REP3-001) that TPO trees at Pilgrim's Hospice had not been identified in the survey or addressed, and the Applicant acknowledged this, supplying an Arboricultural Implications Assessment and an updated Arboricultural Survey Report as late Deadline 4 submissions (REP4-026, REP4-027):
 - i. Does ABC have any comments on the updated documents - in particular the proposed felling of TPO group G37 and the mitigation proposed for this?
 - ii. Is the Applicant seeking permission for the removal of the TPO trees from ABC or through the dDCO?
 - iii. In the latter case, what mechanism does the Applicant propose?
3. **ABC's Landscape Points a-i.** The ExA's FWQ Q 7.2 ii. (PD-008) asked for the Applicant's response to ABC's landscape points a-i in its Relevant Representation (RR) (RR-001). The ExA asked for the pathways to resolution of these matters, and the Applicant referred to the SoCG between the Applicant and ABC (document 8.1), which had not been entered into the Examination at the date of issue of this hearing agenda:
 - i. Would the Applicant and ABC state which matters are now agreed and which are not yet agreed?

F. Nature Conservation

1. **Ashford Green Corridor Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Highfield Lane Roadside Nature Reserve (RNR).**
 - i. Re. the ExA's FWQ Q8.3 vi. (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035), would the Applicant state how mitigation and habitat gains will be delivered in the dDCO (Requirement 9)?
 - ii. Re the SoCG between the Applicant and Natural England (REP3-013), the Applicant notes that a turning circle which forms part of

the Stour Park application, if the turning circle is constructed, would require relocating the translocated RNR. Do ABC and KCC have any comments on this proposal?

- iii. Would the Applicant state whether relocating the translocated RNR would change the assessment conclusions as presented in the ES?
- iv. Would the Applicant supply a copy of Figure 2.7b (APP-068) that illustrates the land required for the turning circle?

2. **Highfield Lane RNR.**

- i. Re. the Applicant's response (REP4-018) to the LIR (REP3-005), can the Applicant provide information about the proposed species mixes for the replacement habitat planting immediately adjacent to the lost area?
- ii. How will this be agreed with the Councils and secured in the dDCO or component plans?
- iii. As suggested by the Councils in their LIR, can the Applicant engage with the Kent Wildlife Trust regarding the suitability of the proposed measures to mitigate the partial loss of the RNR and provide a summary of its discussions to the Examination?

3. **Reptile receptor sites.**

- i. The Applicant's response to the ExA's FWQ Q8.4 (PD-008) states that the majority of the land required for reptile receptor sites is located outside of the dDCO boundary (although on land owned by the Applicant). Can the Applicant confirm how the ExA can be confident that these measures would be delivered outside of the remit of the dDCO?
- ii. What is KCC's response to the Applicant's position?

4. **Compensatory habitat for reptiles and amphibians.**

- i. With regard to the alternative pond that will now be created in plot no 4/11/D following discussions with Friends Life (Environmental Update Report (REP3-022)), can the Applicant confirm that this change will not change the conclusions presented in the ES?
- ii. Are Natural England and the Councils content with this change?

5. **Securing of Monitoring of Planting.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q4.1 (PD-008) and KCC's WR (REP3-023), the Applicant states (REP4-019) that monitoring of new planting will be undertaken post-construction, with the frequency of the monitoring to be determined at the detailed design stage.

- i. Would the Applicant state how monitoring of planting would be secured in the dDCO?

G. Geology and Soils

No questions at this point.

H. Materials

1. **Minerals Assessment.** In KCC's WR (REP3-023), the Council states that: "*The Minerals Assessment that HE has carried out is not comprehensive enough to comply with the Kent Waste and Minerals Plan 2013-30*", and the Applicant responds at Deadline 4 (REP4-019, item 023.09).
 - i. Would the Applicant state when the updated Minerals Assessment, identified as necessary by KCC, will be submitted to the Examination?
2. **Waste Management.** Would KCC state whether suitable waste sites have been identified by the Applicant and discussed with KCC?

I. Noise and Vibration

1. **Thin Surface Course (Low Noise Surfacing):**
 - i. Re. the ExA's FWQ Q11.2 (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035), would the Applicant clarify where in the dDCO low noise surfacing is secured?
 - ii. Re the Highway Agency Pavement Management System (HAPMS), will work to resurface the existing road be programmed as part of the dDCO works?
2. **Existing Acoustic Barriers.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q11.3 iii. (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035), it would appear to be only an 'intention' that the existing acoustic barriers remain unaffected by the Proposed Development:
 - i. What guarantees can the Applicant provide and how will they be secured in the dDCO?
 - ii. If the barriers do not remain for whatever reason, how can adequate replacement be delivered by the dDCO?
3. **Establishing Benefits Due to Noise Mitigation.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q11.4 (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035), the Applicant states that "*Highways England will explore with ABC whether a mutually satisfactory method of establishing benefits due to specific noise mitigation can be undertaken*":
 - i. Would the Applicant state whether this work will be pre or post-DCO?

- ii. Does ABC agree that this approach is appropriate?
4. **Noise and Vibration Limits and Their Significance.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q11.5 (PD-008) and the Applicant's response (REP3-035):
- i. Since the Applicant states that "*it has to be acknowledged that there will be properties adjacent to the existing road network which would receive adverse impacts in the long term*", would the Applicant clarify the significance of the noise effect at the eight and two properties identified in tables 11.11 and 11.16 respectively?
 - ii. Are any of the effects not significant in the current do-minimum circumstance but significant in the future scenarios, thereby necessitating noise insulation requirements?
 - iii. Re. combined construction and construction traffic noise (PD-008, Q11.5 iv), the Applicant states: "*... noise due to construction traffic would principally affect properties adjacent to the A2070 and the A20 which already have background noise levels dominated by traffic. As such these properties are less susceptible to an increase in overall noise level due to construction noise from other activities*". Can the Applicant substantiate this assertion?
 - iv. Although ABC would prefer to see a standard start time for working hours of 08:00 hours (REP3-001), the Council states that "*the sensitive nature of the Pilgrim's Hospice needs to be considered and any houses located near the scheme*". What specifically does ABC have in mind for working hours, and how would the Council expect to see these hours secured through the draft Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)?
 - v. Re. the Applicant's response (REP4-018) to ABC's WR (REP3-001), would the Applicant update the Examination on discussions to date with the Pilgrims' Hospice?

J. Effects on all Travellers

- 1. **Road Safety Audit.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q12.3 i. (PD-008), regarding the Road Safety Audit, this document was supplied by the Applicant as Appendix D to its report 11.9 at Deadline 3 (REP3-035).
 - i. Do ABC, KCC or other IPs have any comments on the Road Safety Audit?

K. Community and private assets

ExA's note: most matters under this heading will be addressed at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on 23 February 2017.

1. **Church Road Public Open Space.** Re. the Applicant's response (REP4-018) to ABC's Deadline 3 submission (REP3-001):
 - i. Would the Applicant and ABC state the current position on the proposed permanent and temporary acquisition of land forming part of the Church Road Public Open Space area, and also part of the Ashford Green Corridor, dedicated as a LNR?

L. Road drainage and water environment

1. **Revised Flood Risk Assessment.** Re. the Environment Agency's (EA) WR (REP3-008):
 - i. Would the Applicant state the status of the revised Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), incorporating the 2016 climate change allowances and other measures required by the EA (eg flood zone storage, effects on Flood Zone 3, flood zone crossings, and provisions for mammals)?
 - ii. Would the Applicant state when the revised FRA will be submitted to the Examination, allowing for the fact that the FRA needs to be reviewed by the EA (approximately 8 – 9 weeks) and agreement needs to be reached before the end of the Examination?
2. **Access to the Aylesford Stream.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q14.1 (PD-008), the EA's WR (REP3-008) and the Applicant's response to RRs (REP3-017) regarding access to the Aylesford Stream, the Applicant has said that additional design information in relation to access will be provided at detailed design stage, and *"suitable Protective Provisions will be included in the dDCO in relation to these matters"*:
 - i. Can the Applicant and EA provide an update on discussions on this matter?
3. **Land contamination and groundwater protection.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q9.3 (PD-008) and the EA's WR (REP3-008) regarding concerns over land contamination and groundwater protection:
 - i. Can the EA comment on the Applicant's response, which states that Requirement 7 of the dDCO is sufficient?
 - ii. Would the Applicant and EA discuss and agree any additional dDCO Requirements to address the concerns stated in the EA WR and submit their proposals to the Examination for Deadline 5?
4. **Pollution prevention.** With regard to pollution prevention, is the EA content with the Applicant's response at Deadline 4 to its WR at Deadline 3 (REP3-008) that the EA will be included in Requirement 3 as a consultee on the CEMP, proposed pollution prevention measures, and the Applicant's interpretation of permitting requirements?

5. **Disapplication of Legislation and Protective Provisions.** With regard to the proposed disapplication of legislation and protective provisions:
 - i. Re. the Applicant's response at Deadline 4 to the EA's WR at Deadline 3 (REP3-008) that discussions are ongoing between the EA and the Applicant, what is the current status? The WR of the River Stour (Kent) Internal Drainage Board (REP3-030) regarding the proposed disapplication of the requirements for formal consents under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act and local Byelaws made under Section 66 of this Act also relates.
 - ii. Re. the disapplication of fisheries legislation, the Applicant states that there is uncertainty as to whether there are any byelaws made under those provisions which affect the Aylesford Stream, and that if the EA is able to confirm that no such byelaws exist, the Applicant indicates that these references can be removed from Article 3 of the dDCO. Is the EA able to confirm this point?
 - iii. If so, would the Applicant include this amendment in the next version of the dDCO?
6. **Structures within the Bylaw Margin.** Re. the EAs WR (REP3-008), the EA seeks design detail of various structures and states that it may be possible to secure this information through the protective provisions:
 - i. Can the Applicant and the EA discuss and agree suitable wording for protective provisions and submit this for Deadline 5?
7. **Dewatering or Abstraction.** Re. the EA WR (REP3-008) sections 4.0 and 5.0, the Applicant envisages needing to pump some ground and surface water into the Aylesford Stream, but is unclear on whether this would be considered 'dewatering' or 'abstraction':
 - i. Can the EA provide clarification on the dewatering/ abstraction point?
 - ii. Can the Applicant confirm that both Requirements 3 (CEMP) and 12 (Surface and foul water drainage) will be amended in the next version of the dDCO to secure consultation with the EA?

M. Combined and Cumulative Effects

1. **Lorry Park.** Re. the ExA's FWQ Q16.1 (PD-008), the Applicant states that "*the proposed Lorry Park did not fit within any of the three 'tiers' included within the Planning Inspectorate's guidance (December 2015), and also doesn't fit with the criteria used in the traffic model as being either 'near certain' (i.e. an approved development proposal) or 'more than likely' (i.e. a development application within the consent process)*".
 - i. Can the Applicant appraise the potential for cumulative effects to give comfort to the Examination that there are not any?

- ii. Do any IPs have any submissions to make regarding the need to consider the lorry park as part of the cumulative impact assessment?

N. Statements of Common Ground

1. Applicant and Ashford Borough Council – At the date of issue of the hearing agendas, this SoCG had not yet been submitted to the Examination. On 8 February 2017 by agreement delivery was re-scheduled for 16 February 2017. **Would the Applicant and ABC state the status of the SoCG and any matters not yet agreed?**
2. Applicant and Environment Agency – At the date of issue of the hearing agendas, this SoCG had not yet been submitted to the Examination. **Would the Applicant and EA state the status of discussions on the draft CEMP, protective provisions, the FRA, access to the Aylsford Stream, contaminated land risk assessment and migration strategy, and groundwater monitoring, as well as any other matters not yet agreed?**
3. Applicant and Friends Life – At the date of issue of the hearing agendas, this SoCG had not yet been submitted to the Examination. Pending agreement between the parties, Friends Life maintains its objection to the Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession of its land. **Would the Applicant and Friends Life state the status of the SoCG and matters not yet agreed?**
4. Applicant and Historic England – A signed SoCG (REP4-005) was submitted at Deadline 4. **Would the Applicant and Historic England confirm the status of the SoCG and state whether there is any intention to undertake any further dialogue on the matters shown as not agreed ie the viability of St Mary’s Church in Sevington, and the combined and cumulative effects of the application with the Stour Park development?**
5. Applicant and Kent County Council – At the date of issue of the hearing agendas, this SoCG had not yet been submitted to the Examination. On 8 February 2017, by agreement delivery was re-scheduled for 16 February 2017. **Would the Applicant and KCC state the status of the SoCG and any matters not yet agreed?**
6. Applicant and Natural England – A signed SoCG (REP3-013) was submitted at Deadline 3 with all matters shown as agreed. **Would the Applicant and Natural England confirm the status of the SoCG?**
7. Applicant and Public Health England – A signed SoCG (REP3-014) was submitted at Deadline 3 with all matters shown as agreed apart from air quality. **Would the Applicant and Public Health England confirm the status of the SoCG and state whether there is any intention to undertake any further dialogue on the matter shown as not agreed ie air quality?**

8. Applicant and South Ashford Developers (Church Commissioners for England, Park Farm Ashford – Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon, GSE Waterbrook) - A signed SoCG was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-015) with all matters shown as agreed. **Would the Applicant and South Ashford Developers confirm the status of the SoCG?**
9. Applicant and Southern Gas Networks (SGN) – as at Deadline 4, the Applicant stated that a SoCG would be finalised and submitted to SGN for final review. **Would the Applicant and SGN state the status of the SoCG?**
10. Any other SoCGs. **Would the Applicant identify any other SoCGs that are being developed?**

Compulsory Acquisition Hearing, 10:00am Thursday 23 February 2017

Administrative arrangements

The hearing room will be available from 9:30am and the hearing will commence at 10:00am. It is expected to close by about 1:00pm.

If you did not do so by the pre-notified deadline, it is vital for Interested Parties intending to attend now to give prior notice to the case team of who will attend, who will speak and which points they wish to address. In accordance with Rule 14(3) of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended), any oral representations should be based on representations previously made in writing by the particular participant.

Please provide your interested party reference number in any communication and mark it for the attention of the M20 Junction 10a case team.

Hearing process

The hearing will refer to the Compulsory Acquisition Negotiations Status Report (REP3-016) supplied by the Applicant at Deadline 3.

For each plot reference, the ExA will invite a brief statement of the current position from the Applicant (Highways England), followed by statements from the other Interested Party(ies) with an interest in that plot.

The purpose of the hearing is to identify matters agreed, matters not agreed, and discussions ongoing. The ExA will ask questions as necessary.

**Issue Specific Hearing dealing with matters relating to the draft
Development Consent Order, 2:00pm Thursday 23 February 2017**

Administrative arrangements

The hearing room will be available from 1:30pm and the hearing will commence at 2:00pm. It is expected to close by about 5:00pm.

Hearing process

The hearing will go through the draft Development Consent Order, working sequentially through the current draft (REP3-011/ REP3-012).

The ExA will take submissions from the Applicant and any other Interested Party.

The purpose of the hearing is to determine the current position with regard to the Articles, Requirements, protective provisions and any other matters, together with actions required to take matters forward.

Open Floor Hearing, 10:00am Friday 24 February 2017

Administrative arrangements

The hearing room will be available from 9:30am and the hearing will commence at 10:00am. It will close as soon as all representations have been heard by the ExA.

Hearing process

There is no agenda for this hearing, which will hear from any Interested Party who wishes to speak and has notified the Planning Inspectorate accordingly.

The ExA will invite each Interested Party to make his or her statement, and will offer the Applicant, and as appropriate other Interested Parties, the opportunity to respond.