



Meeting note

Project name	A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross Scheme
File reference	TR010026
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	23 January 2018
Meeting with	Highways England
Venue	Planning Inspectorate Offices
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Richard Price – Case Manager Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead Katherine King – EIA and Land Rights Advisor James Bunten – Case Officer The Applicant Josh Hodder (Highways England) Karl Sullivan (Highways England) Will Spencer (Highways England) Michael Baker (Arup) David Grattan (Arup)
Meeting objectives	To outline the consultation materials and approach
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Project update

The Applicant provided a brief overview of the evolution of scheme from its inception in 2005 to its announcement in the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) in 2014, noting only minor amendments to the route in that time. The Applicant briefly explained the costs involved and how the project had secured funding early on in the process.

The Inspectorate queried whether there were Statutory Undertaker assets present within the area with the potential to be disturbed. The Applicant explained that existing assets including cable infrastructure has been identified as present and could experience direct impacts. However, initial design solutions had already been developed following positive engagement with the asset owner with a view to agreeing Protective Provisions.



The Applicant also noted a gas main located in close proximity to the redline boundary and discussed their intent to make agreements and enter into a Statement of Common Ground with the owner.

The Applicant set out how its engagement with Cornwall Council, affected landowners and Historic England had influenced the final route; the route was realigned slightly to the north through the Hamlet of Marazanvose in order to lessen potential negative effects on a collection of roadside businesses which included a wedding venue.

The Applicant explained how local engagement events were set up and how the feedback received resulted in the removal of a structure and realignment of the existing A30 to improve the setting of an ancient monument.

The Applicant provided an update on the drafting of its Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which they intended would be comprehensive. The Inspectorate advised that more information was helpful but noted the importance of including a Non-technical Summary (NTS). The Applicant concurred and confirmed the addition of an NTS.

The Applicant explained there had been positive engagement with Environment Agency and other key environmental consultees with regards to drafting the PEIR. The Applicant briefly set out where the nearby internationally designated sites were in relation to the scheme, and noted that they were unlikely to be affected. The Inspectorate advised that if there are no likely significant effects to these sites then a 'no significant effects report' could be provided with the application in accordance with advice contained in Advice Note 10.

Statutory Consultation approach

The Inspectorate queried whether the Consultation booklet included a clear plan of the redline boundary (RLB). The Applicant stated that although the booklet didn't include the RLB, an engineering plan, included in the suite of Consultation documents, displayed the RLB. The Inspectorate advised to clearly name the engineering plan to note the inclusion of the RLB.

The Applicant noted that each landowner, in addition to the standard suite of documents, received a bespoke plan showing the scheme in relation to their plot. A 3D plan of the scheme was made available for the public to view on Youtube.

The Applicant set out that the suite of documents that made up the Consultation package included the Consultation booklet, PEIR and NTS, A0 plans and the engineering plans, which identified the proposed Red Line Boundary (RLB).

The Inspectorate queried how the PEIR would be made available to the statutory consultees (and the Secretary of State). The Applicant stated that the PEIR would be made available electronically by web link; hard copies, DVD/CDs and data-sticks could be provided if requested.

There was discussion about how the Applicant should provide the Inspectorate with the suite of Consultation documents as part of its duty to notify under s46. The Inspectorate



recommended against supplying a web link to the documents and suggested that a cd/ data-stick with the documents on would be more appropriate as the legislation states it should be 'sent to' the Inspectorate.

The Applicant explained how consultation with Cornwall Council (CC) on the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) had progressed with the addition of a further venue for displaying consultation material, as requested by CC. However, the Applicant was unable to accommodate the request of free printing due to consistency restrictions with other Highways England (HE) schemes.

The Applicant stated that the SoCC was published on the project page of the HE website on 18 January 2018 when the s47 correspondence was issued; the s48 notification followed on 25 January 2018. The Applicant noted that it used a broad envelope for its s47 consultation in order to engage with commuters that would use the road.

The Inspectorate queried how hard to reach groups were included in the SoCC and asked for a further detail in this regard. The Applicant explained that the list was not included within the SoCC as their degree of engagement was unclear. It was agreed to include a list of the hard to reach groups as an appendix to the Consultation Report.

There was further discussion regarding what information the Consultation Report needed to capture. The Inspectorate emphasised that the document should seek to demonstrate that all the statutory requirements had been satisfied and include an audit trail for all methods of consultation.

There was brief discussion on the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (The 2017 EIA Regulations); the Applicant confirmed it had submitted a Scoping Report to the Inspectorate under the updated 2017 EIA Regulations. The Inspectorate explained the difference between the former, 2009 and updated 2017 Regulations, noting that the Environmental Statement (ES) should be drafted in line with the adopted Scoping Opinion, and queried whether the RLB had changed since scoping. The Applicant noted minor, subtle changes however no substantial components had been moved.

Next steps

The Applicant noted good dialogue with landowners and highlighted that all access to land to date had been agreed privately. Meetings with CC and Natural England were to be scheduled to agree early drafts of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG).

The Applicant stated that HE had drafted a SoCG template and queried whether SoCG drafts could be shared before finalised. The Inspectorate advised that draft SoCGs, Protected Provisions and 'letters of comfort' were helpful at submission and may help to appoint the Examining Authority earlier in the process.

The Inspectorate advised that the Explanatory Memorandum should be used as an opportunity to clearly explain to the ExA what the provisions do and may help to reduce the amount of written questions during Examination.



The Applicant stated that it planned to provide the Inspectorate with a contact plan ahead of an update meeting with the Inspectorate, once consultation had closed. The Applicant stated it was aiming to provide draft documents in May 2018 ahead of anticipated submission in August/ September 2018.

The Inspectorate outlined its scope for reviewing draft documents, and advised that should the Applicant decide to take advantage of the service, a period of about six weeks should be programmed for the Inspectorate to review and feed back.

The Applicant's attention was drawn to the latest example document published to the Planning Inspectorate's website: [National Grid's 'Guide to the application'](#). All applicants were being advised to prepare an equivalent document as part of its applications for development consent.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following action was agreed:

- HE to contact the Inspectorate with convenient dates for a post-consultation meeting late March 2018.