



Meeting note

File reference	TR030003
Status	Final
Author	Louise Evans
Date	9 August 2017
Meeting with	Port of Tilbury London Limited (PoTLL)
Venue	Videoconference
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate (The Inspectorate) Richard Price – Case Manager Hannah Pratt - Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor Emma Cottam - EIA and Land Rights Advisor Louise Evans – Case Officer The Applicant Charles Hammond, Chief Executive, Forth Ports plc Pamela Smyth, General Counsel and Company Secretary, Forth Ports plc Peter Ward, Commercial Director, Port of Tilbury London Limited (PoTLL) David Housden, Head of Engineering & Procurement, PoTLL Ian Wright, Civil Engineering Manager, PoTLL Sarah Rouse, Atkins Peter Crowther, Atkins Suzanne Gailey, CGMS Louise Ryan, CGMS Francis Tyrrell, Partner, Pinsent Masons Matthew Fox, Solicitor, Pinsent Masons
Meeting objectives	Project Update
Circulation	All

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

Update on project and statutory consultation overview, including issues arising from statutory consultation

The Applicant's statutory period of consultation ended on 28 July 2017. 25 responses were received from statutory consultees. Anglian Water had requested an extension to the deadline for receipt of their response, which the Applicant has granted. The Applicant set out their statutory consultation in a similar way to their non-statutory consultation activities, but wider-reaching. The Applicant's statutory consultation activities consisted of a leaflet drop (75,000 leaflets were distributed); a

project website containing consultation materials including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR); advertisements in local and national newspapers; radio adverts; and five exhibition events (three held in Tilbury, one in Grays and one in Gravesham). An additional Q&A session was also held after all exhibition events in Tilbury. In addition to this, a questionnaire was made available at the public events and online. The Applicant has also met with local interest groups, including the Tilbury Community Forum and Thurrock Park Residents Association.

The Applicant reported that feedback from relevant local authorities has been generally supportive, specifically in relation to the potential socio-economic benefits of the Proposed Development. The Applicant is in on-going dialogue with the host local authority, Thurrock Council.

Some responses received from members of the public requested further information about the Proposed Development, and the Applicant has responded where contact details were provided. 74 completed consultation questionnaires were returned. Concerns were raised in the responses relating to air quality impacts; lighting; noise; ecology and visual impact. The Applicant reported that approximately 40% of consultation responses had expressed support for the Proposed Development; 10% were neutral; and 50% were opposed in some way (i.e. to the Proposed Development as a whole, or elements of it).

Historic England (HE) has requested additional information from the Applicant on the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage assets and how they will be assessed. The Applicant explained that the requested information included additional wireframes to those that had already been shared by the Applicant, to understand the visual impact on Tilbury Fort. The Applicant explained that HE had met the statutory consultation deadline, however raised concerns over the speed of non-statutory responses from HE. The Applicant explained that as a result, the application may not be as progressed as far as hoped in terms of the assessment of impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage. The Applicant confirmed that it will continue dialogue with HE in this regard, noting that a meeting is scheduled for late August. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to include a detailed account of its dialogue with HE within the Consultation Report, and to signpost the relevant officers at HE to the Inspectorate's suite of advice notes and guidance documents on its website. The Inspectorate also offered to host a tripartite meeting with the Applicant and HE, if required, to facilitate progress. The Applicant agreed to keep this option as a possibility if agreement is still not reached as the project develops further.

The Applicant reported that although Thurrock Council had not submitted a full response to the PEIR, it is in support of the Proposed Development and a number of meetings are scheduled to discuss any arising issues. The Applicant hopes to have a s106 agreement with Thurrock Council finalised by the time the application is submitted to the Inspectorate. Gravesham Borough Council submitted a generally positive response to the PEIR. The Applicant will continue to engage with both authorities.

Offsite Ecological Compensation

The Applicant stated that they will be able to provide ecological mitigation/ compensation land within the proposed Order limits for some species (e.g. water voles). However off-site mitigation/ compensation land may also be required for other species (e.g. reptiles). By the time of the submission of their application, the Applicant

aims to have a scheme in place which will provide both on-site (within the Order limits) and off-site (outside of the Order limits) mitigation. The Applicant will also consider the provision of ecological enhancements. The Applicant has been involved in discussions with Natural England, as well as other non-statutory bodies in this respect.

The Applicant explained that landowner agreements were likely to be sought in relation to securing the off-site land and that the DCO will provide a mechanism for its securing as a mitigation measure. The Inspectorate noted that the Applicant will need to ensure that any off-site mitigation/compensation land is appropriately and demonstrably secured, to provide an Examining Authority with confidence to the delivery of such measures.

Infrastructure Corridor

The Applicant gave an overview of their design rationale for the infrastructure corridor. Initially there were three different options for the link road. The design of the separate link road to be put forward in the application is the preferred option due to predicted traffic flows. At non-statutory consultation, some responses raised concerns about potential noise and visual impacts arising from the Applicant's preferred option for the infrastructure corridor. As such the Applicant will also introduce noise barriers adjacent to the corridor. Other landscape features will also mitigate noise and visual impacts.

Land ownership

The Applicant explained that there are four landowners within the infrastructure corridor, with whom they are discussing purchasing the land. The Applicant hopes to have voluntarily secured the land before the application is made, however cannot rule out the need for compulsory purchase at this stage.

The Applicant is also purchasing land from Thurrock Council to provide replacement common land next to that which will be utilised for the Proposed Development.

Master Plan

To address queries from key stakeholders, the Applicant intends to produce a Master Plan document which will set out in detail the locations of key elements of the Proposed Development and explain the operational reasons for why the locations for each were selected. The Master Plan will be included within the Environmental Statement (ES), either as part of the body of the ES or as an appendix.

Draft Documents

The Applicant confirmed that they intend to submit their draft documents for PINS to review on 15 September 2017. These will aim to include the Land Plans, Works Plans, the Book of Reference, Schedule 1 of the Development Consent Order, the Masterplanning Statement, the initial chapters of the ES, and the Rights of Way and Access Plans.

Although the Inspectorate are unable to give a review of the ES in its entirety, the draft Project Description section of the ES was also requested.

Programme

The Applicant confirmed that they intend to submit their Application at the end of October 2017.

The Applicant reported that although the majority of consultation responses received were from areas north of the River Thames, comments in support of the project were also received from the south, and enquired whether examination hearings would be likely to take place on both sides of the river. The Inspectorate advised that only an appointed Examining Authority could decide where examination hearings should be held.

The Applicant confirmed that they would be keen to keep the Pre-Examination period to a minimum.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to keep them informed if the date for submission of draft documents, and/ or the intended date for submission of the application, were expected to change. Early notice of any changes would be vital to allow the Inspectorate to organise/ reorganise internal resources.

Specific decisions/ follow up required?

- Applicant to keep the Inspectorate informed of any changes to submission dates.
- The Inspectorate to send Applicant their list of requirements for examination venues so the Applicant can begin looking into possible venues for examination hearings; if an application is submitted and subsequently accepted for examination.

Advice may be given about applying for an order granting development consent or making representations about an application (or a proposed application). This communication does not however constitute legal advice upon which you can rely and you should obtain your own legal advice and professional advice as required.

A record of the advice which is provided will be recorded on the Planning Inspectorate website together with the name of the person or organisation who asked for the advice. The privacy of any other personal information will be protected in accordance with our Information Charter which you should view before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.