



Meeting note

File reference	TR010020
Status	Final
Author	Wendy Maden
Date	2 December 2014
Meeting with	Highways Agency
Venue	Conference Call – Planning Inspectorate
Attendees	For the Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead Mark Wilson – Infrastructure Planning Lead Hannah Nelson – EIA Advisor Rob Ranger – Case Manager Richard Kent – EIA Advisor Wendy Maden – Assistant Case Officer For the Developer Helen Apps – Highways Agency Laura Colquhoun – Highways Agency Gary Frost – Grontmij Tom Henderson – Bircham Dyson Bell Emma Williamson – Costain Phil Emison – Costain Ben Wade – Costain
Meeting objectives	Conference call to discuss the A19 / A18 Testos Junction
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

Following introductions, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) advised on its openness policy that any advice given would be recorded and placed on the National Infrastructure Planning Portal website under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended (PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 does not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) can rely.

The developer gave a brief description of the development and provided an up-date on the current project team.

The discussion noted the differences in definition of a highways scheme as an 'alteration' or an 'improvement' in the context of the Planning Act 2008 regime. The developer noted that the scheme was likely to be 14.5ha including permanent and operational land. PINS encouraged the applicant to be clear in their definition of the

project as an 'alteration' or 'improvement' scheme and noted the importance of consistency in using the relevant term throughout any documentation.

The relationship between the A19 Testos Junction and A19/A1058 Coast Road Junction Improvement schemes were outlined by the developer. The developer confirmed that they are still exploring the option to utilise surplus material from the A19/A1058 Coast Road Improvement Scheme in the A19 Testos Junction Improvement Scheme but arrangements for the storage of the surplus material has yet to be confirmed. PINS noted the developer's intention to refine the options and firm up the proposal prior to the submission of the development. However, should options for the sourcing, transportation and storage of materials remain at the time of the Development Consent Order submission, PINS would expect to see a description of these options in the Environmental Statement (ES), and an assessment of the impacts associated with these works based on a worst case scenario. A justification for the 'worst case' and clear confirmation of the parameters informing the assessment should be provided in the ES.

The developer clarified the location of the proposed development in relation to the site identified for a potential International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP scheme). The status of that project was noted as well as the indicative timetable for the relevant Area Action Plan (AAP); the AAP was expected to be running about 10 months behind the anticipated submission date for the A19 Testos Scheme. The A19 Testos Improvement scheme includes works to the Downhill Lane Junction and the developer confirmed that additional works to this junction would also be required as part of the proposed IAMP scheme. The developer stated that they are exploring a number of options to coordinate the delivery of these works, either as part of the proposed IAMP scheme, as a separate application or as part of the A19 Testos Improvement scheme application. The developer acknowledged that the decision could have implications on the content and the submission timescale of the proposed development and therefore agreed to inform PINS once a decision had been made on the chosen option which is likely to be in March 2015.

The developer noted that there had been an issue with a broken weblink as part of the recent statutory consultation. They confirmed that the issue had been resolved. PINS encouraged the developer to consider whether and how this should be recorded in documentation e.g. the Consultation Report.

PINS queried whether the developer was satisfied that the consultation had adequately given members of the public fair opportunity to comment on the scheme as a whole and not just the pedestrian/equestrian options. The developer confirmed they were comfortable with the approach taken and noted the content of some responses received had covered points wider than just the pedestrian/equestrian options.

The developer confirmed that discussions were on-going with statutory undertakers with regard to any necessary protective provisions. Discussions were also on-going with the relevant local authorities; South Tyneside and Sunderland.

The developer noted that 11 plots have currently been identified for potential land rights negotiations/compulsory acquisition although they were seeking to avoid the latter if possible. Further endeavour is being undertaken to confirm and finalise the landowner details and it was noted that some Secretary of State land maybe included within the red line boundary.

Should the current proposal progress unchanged, the developer suggested that a set of draft documents could be sent to PINS in February 2015 with a view to arranging a feedback meeting in March. PINS strongly encouraged the sharing of draft documents.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- PINS to provide information in respect of A19 Coast Road comments on draft documents: <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/document/2862570> (link previously contained in email of 2 December 2014).
- The developer to send a copy of the CD containing the PEI to PINS.
- The developer to draft a Contact Plan and send to PINS.