



Preliminary Meeting Note

Summary of Key Points Discussed and Advice Given

Application	Tilbury2
Reference	TR030003
Date	20 February 2018
Venue	Thurrock Hotel, Ship Lane, Aveley RM19 1YN

This meeting note is not a full transcript of the Preliminary Meeting. It is a summary of the key points discussed and responses given. An audio recording of the event is available on the National Infrastructure Planning website.

1. Welcome and Introduction

The meeting opened at 10.00

Lillian Harrison (LH) introduced herself as the Panel lead, welcomed those present and opened the Preliminary Meeting (PM) to consider procedural arrangements for the examination of the application for the Development Consent Order (DCO) to construct and operate the proposed extension to Tilbury docks; the title given by the Applicants to this application is Tilbury2.

LH explained her appointment to be the lead member of the Panel of three Inspectors that will Examine, report upon and make a recommendation to the Secretary Of State (SoS) for Transport on the application by Port of Tilbury London Limited for an Order granting development consent for the Port of Tilbury expansion.

LH explained that she is a chartered Town Planner and Member of the Chartered Institute of Wastes Management. **LH** stated that she has worked in various planning and environmental roles in the minerals and waste industry in the South East of England and has also had various roles in environmental and planning consultancies and in local government, including three years in as minerals and waste planning policy manager for Kent County Council, between 2010 and 2013.

Mike Ebert (ME) introduced himself and explained that he is a Chartered Civil Engineer and a Fellow of the Institute of Consulting. **ME** stated that he has worked as a consultant at the centre of Government over many years, for the Cabinet Office, HM Treasury and most other Government departments. As an engineer, **ME** explained that he has worked in the telecommunications, offshore oil & gas, and roads sectors, and has been Examining Authority for a number of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.

Max Wiltshire (MW) introduced himself and explained that he is a Chartered Civil Engineer and a Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. **MW** stated that he has worked as an engineer, project manager and consultant for a range of companies and public bodies involved in delivering infrastructure schemes, including consulting engineers, local government and utility companies.

LH explained that together as the Panel, the 3 Inspectors constitute the Examining Authority for this application.

LH introduced **Robert Ranger (RR)** as the Case Manager and **Dean Alford (DA)** as the Case Officer for the proposed scheme from the Planning Inspectorate. **RR** then set out the housekeeping rules and emergency procedures.

LH stated that, in addition to the Applicant and local authorities, other attendees were likely to be present as they either represented bodies that are statutory parties; had submitted a relevant representation and were therefore an Interested Party, or were an individual or body affected by the application for compulsory acquisition of land or rights over land. **LH** also confirmed that there could be persons present not covered under any of these descriptions, and welcomed all to the PM.

LH explained that the purpose of the meeting was to focus on how the Panel would be examining the application, and that they would be discussing purely the procedural aspects of the examination. **LH** confirmed that the Panel would not be taking evidence or discussing the merits or otherwise of the DCO scheme at this meeting, and that the merits of the application could only be considered once the Examination had started formally after the close of the PM.

LH stated that there would be a short coffee break at approximately 11:30am for 15 minutes and the aim was to finish this Preliminary Meeting before 1:30pm. The Examination of this application would commence following the closure of the PM and two Open Floor Hearings have been arranged at this venue for later today, one at

2:30pm and the second at 6pm. **LH** welcomed all to stay for the Open Floor Hearings and advised that anyone wishing to provide oral representations in either of the Open Floor Hearings who has not already informed us will need to let the case team know at the earliest opportunity.

LH stated that it was the Panel's aim that everyone who wished to speak would be given an opportunity to, and with this in mind asked all attendees to endeavour to keep their contributions as focussed as possible in order to make the best use of the time available, and to not repeat points already made by others. **LH** explained that a note would be taken of the meeting and that this would be published as soon as possible on the Tilbury2, National Infrastructure Planning website. **LH** also advised that an audio recording would be made and published in the same way as the meeting note.

LH requested that anyone wishing to speak at the tables indicate this by putting their toblerone-shaped name plate on its end and the Panel will offer an opportunity to speak at a suitable time. **LH** requested that anyone who wished to speak who are not at a table, raise their hand. There was a roving microphone which would be used for speakers who do not have access to a static microphone. **LH** instructed all speakers to state their name, and whom they represented and if they were a representative or agent for an Interested Party or Affected Person. **LH** requested that attendees raise their hand if they were unsure of anything discussed so the panel could explain.

LH asked if there were any journalists present. None replied.

LH asked if any of the attendees present intended to record, tweet or film the proceedings for their own use. None replied.

LH advised the attendees that they had the right to report, film or tweet the proceedings, but that this should be done responsibly and in a way so as not to interrupt the proceedings. **LH** asked if any attendees wished to avoid being filmed. None replied.

LH advised that the only official record of the proceedings would be the notes and audio recordings that would be published on the National Infrastructure Planning website, so that any tweets, blogs and similar communications arising from the meeting would not be accepted as evidence in the Examination of the application.

LH then asked those who had registered to speak to introduce themselves and confirmed that the order of parties she addressed

would not indicate that she regarded any party more important than any other.

Mr Robbie Owen (RO) introduced himself as the legal advisor to **Port of Tilbury London Limited (POTLL)** and stated that his colleagues would introduce themselves in turn.

Matthew Fox (MF) and **Francis Tyrell (FT)**, both from law firm Pinsent Masons introduced themselves, **Peter Ward (PW)** Commercial Director for the Port of Tilbury and the project lead for the Tilbury2 project, **John Speakman (JS)** Chartered Surveyor, **Martin Friend (MF)** Vincent and Corbin planning consultants, **Sarah Rowse (SR)** Project Manager for Atkins consultants for the port, **Pamela Smith (PS)** counsel for the Port of Tilbury, **Alex Dillistone (AD)** Winkworth Sherwood legal advisors for the **Port of London Authority (PLA)**, **Jayne Burns (JB)** MMO, **Deborah Priddy (DP)** Historic England, **Jenny Mayer (JM)** English Heritage, **Alice Burgess (AB)** and **John Pingstone (JP)** Highways England, **Robert Hutchinson (RH)** London Gateway Port Limited, **Pat Abbott (PA)** Environment Agency, **Francesca Potter (FP)** Kent County Council, **Chris Purvis (CP)** and **Matthew Gallagher (MG)** Thurrock Council.

RO stated that representatives from Gravesham Borough Council were on their way but had been held up in traffic but are expected to attend this meeting.

LH reminded statutory bodies that unless they had already submitted a relevant representation that they would need to confirm their wish to remain an Interested Party by deadline 1 to take part in the Examination.

2. Principles of the Examination Process

For the benefit of those attendees who may not be familiar with the process **LH** set out the principles governing the nature of the Examination under the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) and in accordance with s87(1) of the Act it is for the Examining Authority to decide how the Examination will be conducted, and that there were six attributes that would govern the way in which the Examination would be conducted; independence and impartiality, rigour, a focus on evidence and justification, openness, fairness, and timeliness. **LH** then expanded on the significance of each of these issues in detail.

LH explained that the draft timetable will be discussed after considering the Preliminary Assessment of Principal Issues. **ME** and **MW** will be explaining these matters.

LH stressed that the effectiveness of the Examination process is dependent on all parties meeting the deadlines set out in the timetable, once it is finalised.

LH raised matters relating to relevant European Law and the decision by the UK to leave the European Union. Some environmental law applicable to decision making on NSIPs is derived from European law and such European directives have effect in the law of England and Wales. **LH** confirmed that should any changes to the operation of relevant European or related UK law be given effect to and commence during the tenure of this Examination, the ExA would move to carry out the Examination on the basis of the law as it is in force at that time. However, for the present time it appears clear that relevant European law remains in force and the intention of the Government is that this should continue to be the case.

LH referred the attendees to Annex E to the letter of 22 January 2018 (Rule 6), where a number of procedural decisions under s.89(3) of the Planning Act 2008 have been made. A number of Errata and additional documents from the Applicant were listed as having been accepted by the Panel, as well as documents from various Interested Parties, which generally were received after the close of Relevant Representations. The ExA have also received additional submissions from the Applicant and others, in response to their Rule 6 letter. The ExA had agreed to publish everything that had been received. However, once the Examination starts, documents will generally only be published at the various deadlines listed in the examination timetable. If evidence is received too late for a deadline, it may well have to be held back to the next deadline before it is published.

LH explained that two other people have been invited to be "Other Persons" as part of the Examination, these parties will then be able to participate in the examination process if they so wish.

LH asked if there were any questions relating to the Examining Authority's Examination of this application generally, (not including timetable matters or the Initial Assessment of Principle Issues, or Statements of Common Ground? None replied.

3. Initial Assessment of Principal Issues

ME referred to the Rule 6 document and in particular Annex B and explained that the panel's Initial Assessment of the Principal Issues arise from the initial consideration of the application documents and Relevant Representations received. **ME** further explained that there are 18 headings in Annex B which have been derived from the draft Development Consent Order itself to a range of issues relating to the construction of the Proposed Development and other issues relating to the various environmental matters. There is also a heading reflecting combined and cumulative impacts – combined impacts due to the interrelationship between the various aspects of the Proposed Development itself, and cumulative impacts due to the Proposed Development in tandem with other developments. There are also a number of points under each heading.

ME stated that although there are a lot of important matters to be examined within the list in Annex B of the Rule 6, it is not intended to be a comprehensive or exclusive list of all relevant matters. **ME** advised that the ExA will consider all important and relevant matters in producing a report in reaching a recommendation for the Secretary of State after the Examination is concluded.

ME explained that the policy and consenting requirements and documents associated with the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) are an integral part of the Examination and are therefore not set out as separate Principal Issues.

ME explained that the Principal Issues will not be discussed in detail at this meeting but asked whether there are any other Principal Issues, not included in the Rule 6 list, that Interested Parties or Affected Parties think should be represented.

RO brought to the attention of the panel 3 points in relation to principal issues.

The first point related to air quality. The Environmental Statement includes an agreement between Thurrock Council and the Applicant that shipping emissions should be screened out of the impact assessments. Subsequent to this, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) were happy that no further assessment was necessary; however, the Applicant has been requested to keep this issue under review.

The second point relates to Cumulative and Combined Impacts. The Applicant confirmed that a document has been submitted to PINS in response to this particular principal issue. The document was submitted last week.

And thirdly, the Applicant stated that the Ports National Policy Statement (NPS) does provide important policy support for this application and the Applicant's position in terms of the need and location of the proposal.

4. Draft Timetable

LH referred to item 4 of the agenda the Draft Timetable for the Examination which was included as Annex C in the rule 6 letter. **LH** explained that item 4 will be combined with Item 7 "Hearings and Accompanied Site Inspection" into one agenda item.

MW explained that after the hearings scheduled this week, the timetable has been constructed such that the first round of written questions will published as early as possible in the examination. Following the panel's consideration of the responses of these questions as well as written representations (WRs) Local Impact Reports (LIRs) from the Local Authorities and Statement of Common Ground's (SoCGs), early Issue Specific Hearings (ISH's) have been scheduled on the assessments that have been made of the likely significant effects of bringing the DCO scheme into operation. ISH will include the following:

- landscape and visual impact
- heritage
- biodiversity
- dredging and navigation
- noise
- air quality and other planning policy
- socio-economic
- other environmental issues

MW stated that if this base information and the calculations undertaken are inadequate, the conclusions as to the effects on traffic flows, river navigation, air quality, noise and other environmental impacts will be unsound.

MW explained that an accompanied site inspection (ASI) will also be conducted at that time in order to ensure that we are familiar with all the relevant features of the locality and its approaches that Interested Parties wish us to be aware of, though separate provision is made to view disputed plots that are proposed for Compulsory acquisition or temporary possession.

MW stated that after a further round of questions, dates have been reserved in June 2018 for Issue Specific hearings to take forward

discussion on outstanding environmental, planning policy and socio-economic and draft DCO issues. Further dates have also been reserved in the same week for a compulsory acquisition hearing (CAH), and a further OFH, if required.

MW explained that the wording of the DCO will be reviewed periodically throughout the examination timetable.

MW explained that towards the close of the Examination there is provision for the ExA to issue for consultation, a RIES (Report on Implications for European Sites), should this be required, and a draft version of the DCO that takes account of any outstanding issues that have not been addressed by the Applicant. **MW** advised a draft DCO is required regardless of the overall recommendation submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS), as the SoS may disagree with those recommendations and must have the opportunity to make his decision based on the fullest available information.

MW advised that following the publication of the draft timetable the ExA have made the following changes.

- Agenda item 6 – the notification of the April hearings and April ASI is removed. The ExA will notify this in the Rule 8 letter to be issued on Tuesday 27 February;
- Agenda item 15 – the notification of the June Hearings is to be brought forward to Thursday 24 May

MW stated that he is aware that the Applicant has proposed changes in a letter dated 13 February which has been published and asked the Applicant to provide an overview of the proposed changes.

RO confirmed that a letter was submitted and covered a number of matters including proposed changes to the draft timetable and also the accompanied site inspection. The first point is that the Applicant are of the view that the hearing notifications for the April and June hearings should be brought forward to give the Applicant enough time to place the required statutory notices that the applicant is obliged to place. **RO** asked if this has already been brought forward to the 24 May? **RO** also asked for confirmation that Item 6 was going to be revised?

MW advised that this will be confirmed in the Rule 8 letter.

RO continued and stated that in relation to the April hearings and in particular to the hearing planned for the 18 April, to ensure 21 days' notice could be given, the Applicant will need details of the hearing

date time and place by the 14 March, to enable the applicant to meet the relevant deadlines. Similarly, for the June hearings, currently planned for the 19, 20 & 21 June, the Applicant would need to be notified by the 17 May to meet the required deadline. In relation to item 15 of the draft timetable, **RO** asked if this will be moved to the 24 May, which he doesn't think will be sufficient to meet the 21 day deadline and can this be reconsidered?

LH advised the Applicant 21 days is a statutory requirement and 28 days is a "nice to have". If PINS allow for 2 days after deadline 4, this would give sufficient time to the Applicant to meet the deadline.

RO advised that the expert ecologist for the Applicant is unavailable for the June hearings and requested whether these hearings can be moved to the following week.

RO stated that deadline 2 is affording less than the guidance from the ministry view of 21 days for parties to submit comments on LIR's and suggested that the hearing agenda release date be pushed back to 11 April and that deadline 2 could be moved accordingly.

RO suggested that comments on the ExA draft DCO should be submitted at deadline 7 to enable the Applicant to take comments into account in submitting the final version of the DCO at deadline 8, which would accord with normal practice in these matters. **RO** requested confirmation of when the ExA would want to receive the plans for the ASI and finally for clarity, wherever in the draft timetable there are references to post hearing submissions or answering the panel's requests for information those might be clarified by just relating back to the relevant hearing or a deadline to which the submissions concern relate.

With regard to the ASI, **RO** explained that the Port has experience of showing people around the Port and the site of Tilbury2 as proposed and it will be a long day to complete the ASI in the one day. **RO** would encourage the panel to do this over 2 days and this is what the applicant believes the panel are now considering.

MW confirmed that all the suggestions will be considered and the Rule 8 letter will reflect the suggestions. **MW** asked if any other parties had comments.

JB from the MMO requested a consideration in relation to the SoCG's, due to the list of matters currently still under discussion, at each deadline if a draft of the latest version of SoCG's could be submitted until all matters are resolved.

MW confirmed that the ExA will reflect on what has been discussed today and a firm timetable, albeit always able to be reviewed with due notice, will be published with the Rule 8 letter following this meeting.

MW explained it is important to note that the ExA cannot consider any information submitted after the Examination has closed. The date of Monday 20 August 2018 represents a final deadline for receipt of any material and the deadlines shortly before that date are to ensure that final comments can be made prior to that statutory conclusion of the Examination. It is important for all parties to adhere to the deadlines in the timetable.

5. Provision for Site Inspections

MW proceeded to advise parties on the provision of site inspections both unaccompanied and accompanied and how it is proposed to carry these out and how they fit in to the overall timetable.

MW explained the ExA propose to carry out site inspections to locations affected by the application proposals. **MW** confirmed the ExA has already started to familiarise themselves with the land environs of the proposed order area by carrying out an unaccompanied site inspection (USI) from publicly accessible locations. **MW** advised a note of the locations visited on this site inspection will be published on the PINS website. **MW** advised the ExA may undertake unaccompanied site inspections on later dates during the Examination if matters are raised in relation to locations that can be viewed from publicly accessible places. All USI's will be reported and published.

MW explained in addition to USI's, it is possible for the ExA to hold an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) of specific locations that Interested Parties may wish to nominate. **MW** confirmed Monday 16 and Tuesday 17 April 2018 has been reserved for this purpose in the draft timetable. **MW** also advised the ExA are also reserving the possibility that Affected Persons may wish to suggest disputed plots following the CA Hearing in April.

MW advised the ExA are conscious that there may be sensitivities about the conduct of such visits. For example, it may not be prudent or even be possible for the ExA to visit potentially hazardous operational sites. If such visits are requested, the normal process would be for parties to agree who might accompany the ExA on a representative basis, to ensure that the inspection is open and fair, rather than arranging for everybody to attend. The

Applicant and at least some Interested Parties would need to be present to ensure fairness. All parties are invited to notify PINS of possible locations that should be visited on the April ASI by Wednesday 4 April 2018. If parties wish to nominate a location for the ExA to visit, please state the location, the features to be observed, whether the locations can be viewed from public land, the reasons for nomination, whether and why you think that an accompanied inspection is necessary and, if so, who should accompany the ExA.

MW advised if land isn't publicly accessible, consent may be required to enter onto the land and PINS should be advised as to whom that consent can be obtained from. The ExA may also need assistance to ensure particular sites can be inspected safely, and this would require the inspection to be on an accompanied basis. It should be noted that when the ExA undertake site inspections, the ExA will not ask for or hear any oral submissions or receive any documents from anyone. Questions will be confined to matters of fact to ensure that we are observing the correct land or features.

MW asked if any parties have any comments on the site inspection programme.

6. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)

LH requested an update from all parties on the preparation of the SoCG's requested.

RO confirmed that on 14 February 2018 a SoCG update was submitted to PINS and this has been published. The report included updates of five parties that the Applicant has consulted with in regard to SoCG. These parties are as follows:

- Thurrock Council
- Gravesham Borough Council
- Essex County Council
- Environment Agency
- MMO

RO confirmed that these drafts have been submitted as they are at a stage which the applicant considers would benefit the ExA and for all interested parties to review.

RO also confirmed that the Applicant is in the process of consulting on SoCG's with the following additional parties:

- Natural England

- Historic England
- The Port of London Authority
- Highways England
- The Cole family and the Common Land Conservators
- The Gothard family
- Network Rail
- Kent County Council
- A Bug Life
- English Heritage
- London Gateway Port Limited
- Public Health England
- London Resort Holdings
- Cadent

RO confirmed that all SoCG's with these parties are at various stages, however, all SoCG's will be provided to PINS in readiness for deadline 1 of the examination timetable. All SoCG's that have been submitted, will be updated.

RO also confirmed that the Applicant would be happy to provide updates on all SoCG's at each deadline in the timetable as requested by the MMO earlier in today's meeting. **RO** also encouraged all parties to engage with the Applicant on their particular SoCG's as this will be of benefit not only to the ExA but to all other interested parties and stakeholders.

RO advised that a cross referencing table will also be provided at deadline 1 to the topics and themes that the ExA have identified in the rule 6 letter. **RO** stated that individual SoCG's will be submitted for each party rather than submitting SoCG's for topics/ themes as the Applicant feels this would be more difficult to orchestrate.

ME confirmed that the approach described above is a sensible and adequate process. **ME** asked whether the Applicant has consulted with RWE Generation.

RO confirmed that no SoCG has been consulted on to date; however, both parties are in discussions in relation to the interface between the Tilbury2 project and the RWE power station scheme and this should result in detailed agreement or agreements in due course. **RO** stated that a SoCG would be considered if the ExA feel this is necessary.

ME advised that there would be a need for some sort of position statement between the 2 parties.

RO confirmed that the Applicant will take this away for consideration.

AD from the Port of London Authority noted that the ExA haven't requested a SoCG for Transportation and Traffic between the Applicant and POLA. The POLA is the conservancy authority for the river and does have an interest in the use of the river and the impacts in navigation. **AD** confirmed that the parties are in negotiations on a SoCG.

LH requested that the Applicant provide an update on their SoCG consultation with Cadent Gas.

RO confirmed that the Applicant is in consultation with Cadent on a SoCG. A SOCG document is yet to be drafted however the reference number SOCG19 has been allocated.

6. Additions to the Timetable

LH advised that this meeting is a procedural meeting and whilst the documents requested are focusing on technical issues, the ExA felt that timetabling matters are matters for this Preliminary Meeting, therefore, item 6 has been added to the agenda as it is focussing on timetable matters, in particular, the updated ES Chapter and associated reports, plans and diagrams which will consider and conclude upon in-combination and cumulative effects arising from the Proposed Development together with the Lower Thames Crossing and also with Tilbury Energy Centre. **LH** stated that the panel are asking for the dates when the Applicant will be submitting the written details of the off-site ecological mitigation/compensation scheme.

RO provided a brief explanation of the Cumulative and In-combination assessment of effects arising from the proposed development together with the Lower Thames Crossing and Tilbury Energy Centre (RWE scheme) as detailed in the Applicants response to the relevant representations document submitted to PINS last week. This document relates to all the RR's the Applicant has received for this application. **RO** advised that chapter 2 of this document specifically refers to the cumulative and in-combination effects in relation to the Lower Thames Crossing and Tilbury Energy Centre schemes. In summary, a conclusion of the Applicant is that an assessment across all disciplines dealt with by the ES including Marine Ecology is not appropriate or is even possible for the following three reasons:

- Lack of design proposals for the other schemes;

- Lack of traffic data particularly in the case of the Lower Thames Crossing;
- Lastly that the Tilbury2 scheme is far ahead of the other schemes in time.

RO stated that due to the limited availability of the works proposed on the two other schemes, the Applicant would expect Highways England and RWE to consult with POTLL on any overlap or conflict in land use once more detail is available on these proposals. However, **RO** confirmed that POTLL are already in consultation with RWE in relation to the Tilbury Energy Centre scheme, in fact, yesterday the Applicant was made aware of RWE's own non- statutory consultation in relation to their project.

RO advised that discussions are on-going with land interests concerned for the off-site mitigation proposals and referred to paragraph 2.3 of the Applicants letter dated 14 February. This document provides more initial detail on the ports plans for off-site ecological compensation. The Applicant is aiming to submit the ecological mitigation and compensation plan EMCP at deadline 1. **RO** confirmed this document may need to be revised as the examination proceeds.

7. Any other Submissions regarding Procedural Matters

RO requested that the ExA encourage Interested Parties to comment on relevant representations already submitted within their written representations, and also to comment on the Applicants responses to these relevant representations. **RO** requested that the ExA consider removing the responses to RR's from deadline 1.

ME advised that the ExA will consider this request when finalising the Rule 8.

RO requested that an addition to deadline 2 is included in the Rule 8 for parties to submit suggestions for the ASI. **ME** confirmed this will be included.

LH stated for the benefit of Gravesham Borough Council that the Panel have agreed to carry out ASI's on Tuesday 17 April on the Gravesham side of the river and Monday 16 April on the Tilbury side.

Wendy Lane (WL) Gravesham Borough Council requested that the time of day the ASI will take place on the Gravesham side of the river is considered due to lighting considerations.

LH requested that Gravesham Borough Council provide written requests detailing their reasons for ASI proposals.

ME advised that the ExA are considering hearings on the south side of the river, however, this could be difficult logistically. The ExA will work with the case team who in turn will liaise with the Applicant to find the best solution.

RO advised that the Applicant would provide written confirmation of post hearing submissions including submissions of oral case sooner than is requested in deadline 1, however, **RO** suggested it would be of benefit if the submissions are published on the PINS website.

The meeting adjourned at 11.22 and resumed at 11.40

LH welcomed everyone back after the short interval and stated that there are a few items that need confirming following the mornings discussions. **LH** requested that **RO** provide an update on the items the Applicant took away from the morning's discussions. Firstly, **LH** requested an update on the Applicants view on whether the 24 May is sufficient for the notification of the June hearings.

RO provided an overview of the dates the local newspapers in particular the Gravesham Messenger and the Thurrock Gazette are available to publish notifications and as a result, **RO** suggested that the June hearings are moved back a week to 26 June as this will then provide the Applicant with the required timeframe to publicise the June hearings.

RO also suggested that if the June hearings are put back a week, the 2 items in deadline 6 namely "Comments on responses on further information requested by the Panel" and "Comments on responses on post hearing submissions including written submissions of oral case" be moved to deadline 7.

LH confirmed that the ExA will consider the Applicants suggestions and would agree subject to other party's comments.

Colin Elliott, a local resident, advised the Panel that the suggestion for the newspaper publications giving a full weeks' notice is a positive suggestion as he has experience of events happening in the local area prior to them being publicised in the local media.

WL stated that the Gravesham Borough Council communicate effectively with their local residents by use of social media and other such media and wanted to state for the record that the council doesn't see the 21 day time period being a problem in their area.

RO advised the ExA that there would be an issue with holding hearings on Friday 22 June should this date be reviewed for hearings, **LH** advised the Applicant that the Panel would have to take all suggestions away prior to finalising the timetable in the rule 8 as the timetable as a whole will need reviewing with assistance from colleagues in PINS and the case team.

LH advised that the ExA has received notification from Interested Parties who wish to attend an Open Floor Hearing but no attendees have expressed an interest to speak. The timetable will request that Interested Parties let PINS know if they wish to speak in any future Open Floor Hearing as there may not be a requirement for any further open floor hearing if there are no requests to speak.

RO advised that the Applicant can produce an itinerary for the 2 day ASI as stated in their recent submission, however, **LH** reminded the Applicant that the Planning Inspectorate attendees could not accept any hospitality from the Applicant at lunch during the ASI as proposed in the draft itinerary and suggested that the Panel is given a half an hour lunch break at a location where we can purchase our own sandwiches.

LH advised the Applicant that the ExA would welcome early submissions of written responses to oral representations, however, the ExA will not formally request submissions as this would mean a change to the timetable. **LH** confirmed that early submissions would be published unless there are resource issues in the office.

LH prior to closing this meeting asked if there are any other suggestions or issues that anyone wishes to raise or discuss.

Steven Mason a resident of Tilbury requested advice on whether the proposed development would have any effect on the house prices in the local area.

LH advised Mr Mason that as far as she is aware house prices are not a planning matter and suggested that Mr Mason talk with the Applicant outside of this meeting. **LH** advised stated that the ExA would welcome any submissions on planning matters if Mr Mason wished to make written submissions.

RO advised that the Applicant would be happy to speak to Mr Mason outside of this meeting.

- Meeting closed at 12.07 -