

## Meeting note

<b>Project name</b>	A417 Missing Link
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Date</b>	24 July 2019
<b>Meeting with</b>	Highways England
<b>Venue</b>	Planning Inspectorate offices, Bristol
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project Update Meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	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.

The Applicant provided a brief update on the history and progress of the scheme to date, noting that the Preferred Route Announcement was made in March 2019 and it was now a Tier 1 scheme. A Scoping Opinion was issued in June 2019.

In respect of the Scoping Opinion, the discussion noted that the Scoping Report was high level. The Applicant provided updates to work progressing, including on landscape and archaeology. The Applicant sought clarification on the following points:

- Does “design envelope” mean order limits (ref in Scoping Opinion ID 4.3.18). The Inspectorate confirmed that this was in reference to the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach. Specifically, in determining the likely visibility of the scheme, the Inspectorate recommended that the Applicant makes clear the assumptions (i.e. the maximum/ minimum vertical alignment and horizontal alignment, plus any potential variations in vertical/ horizontal alignment) upon which the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is based.
- Can the Inspectorate provide more explanation of the term “independent monitoring” (ref in Scoping Opinion ID 4.9.4). The Inspectorate explained that ‘independent monitoring’ was intended to mean monitoring as undertaken by an external consultancy and commissioned by the Applicant.

The Applicant sought to give an overview of updates to the project and noted that some elements were still being considered. For example, they noted that there could be opportunities to remove some of the existing A417 carriageway. The Inspectorate queried whether such matters would be resolved before any statutory consultation began. The Applicant indicated that it was working through all the options and alternatives and anticipated completing this work in advance of any statutory consultation.

The Applicant gave a brief overview of potential land interests and commercial interests that could be affected, noting that the relevance or impact on some of these would depend on which option/alternative was selected. It was noted that the National Trust own land connected to Crickley Hill Country Park.

In respect of the next steps, the Applicant indicated that it was already working with the relevant local authorities with regard to a draft Statement of Community Consultation. The Applicant was hopeful of undertaking statutory consultation later in the year. A tight timetable was acknowledged and the Applicant agreed to keep the Inspectorate updated on progress. The Inspectorate queried whether the Applicant may look to send a/some draft documents for the Inspectorate to review. The Applicant confirmed its intention to do so.