



Meeting note

Project name	M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange Improvement
File reference	TR010030
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	20 February 2018
Meeting with	Highways England (HE)
Venue	Rivergate, Bristol
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead Gail Boyle – Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor Ewa Sherman – Case Officer The Applicant Jacqueline Watson – DCO lead, Atkins Neil Watson – EIA lead, Atkins Jonathan Wade – Project Manager, Highways England Nicholas Coombes – DCO Advisor, Highways England
Meeting objectives	Project update meeting
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 an update in relation to the project, after the Inspectorate had issued the Scoping Opinion pursuant to the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, on 22 January 2018. The Inspectorate explained that a late response had been received which will be forwarded to the Applicant; however, it will not feature as part of the Opinion. The Applicant felt that relationships with the EIA consultation bodies were generally positive and that they did not foresee any major or substantive issues or points of difference arising as a result of the feedback on the Scoping Report.

The parties discussed several issues that were addressed by the Scoping Opinion and the Applicant noted that a response to the Opinion would be included as an Appendix to the Environmental Statement (ES). Matters discussed related to issues such as fine particulate matter and air quality with the Inspectorate noting that it will be for the Applicant to justify why an assessment of PM_{2.5} is being scoped out. Similarly, Highways England's proposed approach to providing a Health Impact Assessment was discussed.



The Applicant expressed some doubt about the applicability of a Major Accidents and Hazards assessment and the methodology for this in the context of a highway improvement scheme. The Inspectorate advised that European guidance exists on what the assessment should address in relation to vulnerability of the proposed development to risks of major accidents and/ or disasters and the potential for the development to cause such events. The Applicant outlined their intended approach to the assessment which would be about the extent to which the proposed development would be likely to cause a major accident or disaster, or increase the risk of vulnerability to such events.

The Applicant advised that ground investigations (GI) would not be completed in time to inform the submission of the DCO application and ES. The Environment Agency had been consulted on this and had indicated that they would not object to the information being submitted later at the examination stage. The Applicant raised a query about whether a full GI report could be submitted later, possibly by way of an appendix or addendum to the ES post submission. In line with the comments given in the Scoping Opinion, the Inspectorate advised that if this information is required in order to assess the significant environmental effects of the development then it must form part of the ES or the ES should set out clearly what assumptions have been made. The Inspectorate further advised that if this is not the intention, then it will be a matter for the Applicant to justify why the information forms supplementary data and is not required for the purposes of EIA. It will check further about the implications of providing addendum / additional provisions to the ES during the examination of the DCO application, but advised that this approach carries risk including risk to acceptance of the application for examination. The Inspectorate further advised that the ES should explain what surveys have therefore been undertaken to inform the ecological suitability of SPA compensation areas.

In their response during the scoping process Guildford Borough Council (GBC) requested that the impact of aircraft noise is assessed. The Applicant stated that road traffic noise is the dominant noise source in the area of the proposed development. The Inspectorate noted that it had been contacted by GBC to arrange a tripartite meeting. The Applicant confirmed that they have organised a workshop/ presentation to the Local Authorities (LAs) to enable knowledge sharing, and feel that they have worked hard to establish positive and constructive relationship with the statutory consultees, the host authorities GBC and Elmbridge Borough Council, and Surrey County Council.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to provide clarity about what information has been used to inform EIA regarding the Transport Assessment. There are merits in including a Traffic and Transport chapter in the ES as statutory consultees are used to seeing this for other projects, although it could be presented separately if necessary. The traffic assessment should consider the benefits and impacts for people, communities and overall users, and the ES should explain how the noise and air quality assessments are based on traffic modelling.

The Applicant has been conducting various environmental surveys of the M25 junction 10 area and at this point in time does not envisage that there will be a need for requests under s53 of the PA2008. Access agreements have been secured for much of the relevant area already.

Consultation



A Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) had been published on 29 November 2017, following the comments from three local authorities. The Applicant had provided the authorities with longer than the statutory minimum to submit comments on the draft SoCC. The Applicant started early engagement and was able to accommodate most of the changes suggested or requested by the host authorities. The main exceptions related to requests to hold events or provide materials at locations dependent upon 3rd party consent. For example, it had not been possible to obtain agreement to hold some events in nearby supermarkets or other commercial premises. Nevertheless, provision was made for a public event during each week of the consultation period at a range of venues and locations. It was estimated that approximately 300 people attended the exhibition held over the first weekend of consultation.

Consultation under section 42 and section 47 is being carried out between 12 February and 26 March 2018, over a six week period, and the statutory consultees have been notified under the new EIA Regulations 2017.

The Applicant has sent letters to about 90,000 addresses in the vicinity of the proposed development. The Applicant confirmed that all of the EIA consultation bodies identified by the Inspectorate have been consulted. A small number of the bodies prescribed in the APFP Regulations 2009 were discounted as not meeting the relevance test in the Regulations, but in most cases a precautionary approach to consultation was adopted, with parties being consulted in any border line cases. The Inspectorate advised that the reasons for doing so should be fully explained in the finalised Consultation Report. The Applicant will also provide a list of their s42 consultees to the Inspectorate. The Applicant outlined the current land interests were in the region of: 660 addresses, 60 Category 1 Persons, 20 Category 2 persons, and around 500 Category 3 persons (precautionary approach), and noted that it is the intention to refine the Category 3 list once the full EIA has been completed.

The Applicant advised that due to a printing error the statutory Consultation Brochure has been revised on 12 February 2018. The revised brochure has been published on Highways England's website and the Inspectorate confirmed that they had downloaded a copy of this. All consultees were in the process of being notified and/or being sent a copy of the revised brochure.

Other matters

There was discussion about the incorporation of part of the Smart Motorway Project (SMP) for M25 J10-16 within the J10/A3 Wisley Interchange project. The Inspectorate confirmed their agreement that this would not invalidate the EIA scoping to date.

There was also a discussion about further design development post-consultation and the approach to be taken should further amendments to the DCO boundary be required. The Inspectorate advised that additional s48 publicity will not be required for small scale minor/ non-material changes and that in principle additional targeted consultation should be sufficient. However, it was recommended that this matter be discussed further once the extent of likely change is known. The Inspectorate advised that changes to the redline boundary should be made before the submission of the DCO application.



The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider allowing time for a review of the draft documents. A full review of a suite of draft application documents takes about 6 to 8 weeks but 3 weeks was advised as being the absolute minimum period of time. The Applicant considered that any review would be likely to be requested around late June / early July 2018 and the Inspectorate advised that any such requests should be made at least 3 months before the planned submission date.

The parties discussed the HRA Evidence Plan process and indicated that consultation is ongoing with Natural England (NE) although it appears unlikely at this stage that they will be able to engage with the Evidence Plan process. The Inspectorate has provided s51 advice on the Evidence Plan process and the roles of The Inspectorate and Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies in it, and advised that while it can be a helpful process it is not a mandatory one. The Applicant agreed to update progress on this at the next meeting.

The Applicant indicated that a DCO application is expected to be submitted in Q4 of 2018.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The parties will arrange a suitable date for a teleconference.
- The Inspectorate will contact Guildford Borough Council
- The Inspectorate will investigate the implications of providing additional provisions to the ES following DCO application.