



Meeting note

File reference	TR010016
Status	Final
Author	James Bunten
Date	19 November 2015
Meeting with	Highways England
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Attendees	Highways England Salvatore Zappala Fay Tresidder (Mott MacDonald) Clare Postlethwaite (Mott MacDonald) Zoe Walne (Mott MacDonald) James Butt (Mott MacDonald) Sarah Sutherland (Burgess Salmon) Julian Boswell (Burgess Salmon) The Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest - Infrastructure Planning Lead Gail Boyle – Senior EIA Advisor Hannah Nelson – EIA Advisor Lyndon Baker – Consents Service Unit James Bunten – Case Officer
Meeting objectives	Project update 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 its 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 advised that they were close to a 'design freeze' for the preliminary design of the scheme with the aim of beginning statutory consultation in early 2016. HE gave an update on changes to the scheme since the previous meeting and advised that the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) had been sent to the relevant local authorities for consultation; the 28 day consultation period was still ongoing.

There was a brief discussion regarding the Sevington scheme, which HE confirmed had been submitted to Ashford Borough Council (ABC). HE confirmed that if planning permission was refused for the Sevington scheme, the HE scheme would still proceed. The Inspectorate queried whether there would be any overlap of the consultation periods for the two schemes, highlighting the potential for confusion for local residents. HE advised there is only an overlap of a couple of weeks.

There was discussion regarding these other schemes in close proximity and their relationship to the M20 Junction 10a scheme. The Inspectorate advised that HE's Consultation Report could include a narrative regarding responses that did not relate to their scheme; HE noted that irrelevant consultation responses could be forwarded to the respective project team.

HE explained their consultation plans scheduled for January 2016. The Inspectorate noted that HE could conduct their consultation under s47 and s48 at the same time and HE provided clarity with respect to the notices to be published and the relevant timescales. There was discussion on the criteria for identifying interested parties with HE querying the size of the radius for direct involvement. The Inspectorate advised that ABC could advise them of which areas should be included when they review the draft SoCC. The Inspectorate also advised that ABC can use its local knowledge to recommend the consultation radius.

There was discussion regarding engagement with relevant environmental consultees with regard to protected species mitigation licences. HE advised that protected species had been found on the site and discussions with Natural England (NE) with regards to relocation had been instigated but no detailed engagement had taken place to date. The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that their Development Consent Order boundary should be sufficiently wide to encompass any land required for species translocation or enhancement schemes.

There was brief discussion regarding the need for any letters of no impediment (LoNI) in respect to protected species. HE advised that licences for dormice would be required and potentially for badgers. The Inspectorate advised that it is beneficial to begin engagement with NE in respect to securing the necessary LoNI's as the process may take longer than anticipated. The current level of engagement between NE and Highways England was discussed, in particular that HE had contacted NE on several occasions to arrange meetings, but had not received any engagement in return. The Inspectorate advised that HE should keep a record of all dialogue with NE.

HE confirmed there were no major Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) issues to note.

HE queried whether they would need to re-scope if there were any changes to the Red Line Boundary. The Inspectorate advised that it is not a requirement to re-scope if a Red Line Boundary changes, however they drew attention to the need to review and ensure any subsequent consultation was appropriately carried out.

The Inspectorate requested an update on the survey work completed. HE advised that the majority of the survey work had been completed apart from the wintering bird surveys, which are to be redone.

The Inspectorate queried whether design drawings will be included in the draft documents suite for the Inspectorate review noting the benefits of having high level

information available in order to examine an application appropriately. The Inspectorate also emphasised the 'worse-case scenario' needs to be included in the Environmental Statement and advised that fixing parameters early on in the process is beneficial.

Air quality was briefly discussed with HE advising they did not believe there were any air quality management areas in the vicinity of the Development Consent Order boundary, but they did note that more data may be required.

The Inspectorate asked if the application would include compulsory acquisition (CA). HE advised that the Book of Reference (BoR) does include some plots subject to CA including plots affecting the relevant local authorities. HE also clarified it was intending to use the General Vesting Declaration procedure and requested any advice that the Inspectorate could provide on this.

The Inspectorate highlighted the issues related to making material changes and queried if the scheme includes any common land or other designated land. HE advised that the scheme currently includes a small plot of common land; however the red line boundary may be altered to remove it. HE will provide an update to the Inspectorate on this in due course. The Inspectorate also queried if land owned by the Secretary of State (previously Crown land) had transferred to HE. HE will review this and reflect the position in the BoR.

HE gave a brief overview of potential objections and requested amendments raised by local action groups and discussed the local meetings they had been invited to attend outside of their organised events. The Inspectorate advised that HE are only statutorily required to attend the meetings set out in their SoCC, however reiterated the value of consultation was to draw out as many issues in the Pre-Application stage as possible.

HE queried about the s46 notification with the Inspectorate advising that the suite of consultation documents sent to bodies identified as part of the statutory s42 consultation, should be sent to the Inspectorate on or before it commences. The Inspectorate also suggested draft documents could be discussed with the Inspectorate in Q1 2016 in order to give feedback in time before anticipated submission.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

It was agreed that a telecon could be scheduled before Christmas with a further meeting held early 2016 ahead of the draft documents being submitted.