



Meeting note

File reference	TR010006
Status	Final
Author	James Bunten
Date	4 June 2015
Meeting with	Highways England
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Attendees	Highways England Valerie Stephens Salvatore Zappala Fay Tresidder (Mott MacDonald) Andrew Jarmin (Mott MacDonald) Clare Postlethwaite (Mott MacDonald)
	The Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest - Infrastructure Planning Lead Gail Boyle – Senior EIA Advisor Tracey Smith – EIA Advisor James Bunten – Case Officer
Meeting objectives	Project Update Meeting for the M20 Junction 10A scheme
Circulation	All above

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

Highways England (HE) was reminded of the Planning Inspectorate's (the Inspectorate's) openness policy that any advice given would be recorded and published on their website under s51 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) (PA 2008) and that any advice given does not constitute legal advice upon which the applicants (or others) can rely.

HE outlined how they were shaping the design of the scheme following recent traffic modelling and noted on-going informal consultation with Kent County Council and Ashford Borough Council (the relevant authorities); a draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) had been produced and initial feedback from the authorities had been received. The Inspectorate noted that they can review a draft SoCC if requested.

HE discussed their plans for the statutory consultation period, due to commence later in the year, and noted that consultation under s42, 47 and 48 of the PA 2008 was planned to be conducted at the same time. Guidance from the relevant local

authorities on appropriate deposit locations and communities to consult had been received.

HE set out how they planned to consult the local community under s47 of the PA 2008. The Inspectorate noted that all the non-statutory and statutory consultation methodology should be captured in the Consultation Report.

HE discussed how they had been defining the scheme and noted that a small amendment may be needed to the red line boundary. In response to HE's query, the Inspectorate confirmed that requesting a scoping opinion was not a statutory part of the process and that in light of the nature of the amendment it was not necessary for a revised scoping opinion to be sought.

In response to a query from the Inspectorate, HE confirmed that the scheme was considered to be a construction project and not an improvement. The Inspectorate advised the project page on their website would be updated to reflect this.

There was discussion regarding the detail contained in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI). The Inspectorate advised that including a non-technical summary would be accessible for the local community whilst certain detailed appendices of the Environmental Statement (ES) may be included for relevant statutory consultees and interest groups. The importance of pre-application consultation was noted to seek to avoid issues arising following submission of an application.

There was discussion regarding the nearby Town and Country Planning Act application "Sevington (AXA/DMI)" and the relationship with the M20 Junction 10a scheme. It was agreed that it would be central to the approach taken to pre-application consultation that communities understood the distinction and inter-relationships between these two schemes. To reduce ambiguity, it was crucial that a clear description was included in the final SoCC so that communities were aware of what they were being consulted on.

It was further noted that the outcome of the Sevington (AXA/DMI) scheme may impact on the detailed design of the M20 Junction 10a scheme and could potentially impact on the funding arrangements.

HE briefly discussed funding arrangements and noted that the scheme would not include a s106 agreement or community infrastructure levy. Finalising the funding arrangements before submission was discussed, with the Inspectorate emphasising that the Funding Statement should set out what funding arrangements had been agreed.

Land ownership and compulsory acquisition (CA) was discussed with HE advising what was already owned and what would need CA. HE noted discussions with land owners was on-going with the Inspectorate advising that dialog should be increased in the run up to submission and highlighted that alternatives to CA would be investigated during Examination.

The Inspectorate explained what application documents could be submitted in draft form for feedback, these included: draft Development Consent Order, Explanatory Memorandum, Book of Reference and Statement of Reasons. It may also be possible for the Inspectorate to provide feedback on: Consultation Report, Non-Technical

Summary, Funding Statement and certain chapters of the ES. HE advised they will look into drafting a contact plan for submitting the draft documents.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- Applicant to confirm change of name to remove "Improvement"
- Applicant to confirm a suitable 'Likely submission date' for the website
- Applicant to draft Contact Plan with the Inspectorate in respect of timing for draft document review