



Meeting note

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| File reference | TR040009 |
| Status | Final |
| Author | Wendy Maden |
| Date | 4 December 2014 |
| Meeting with | Network Rail |
| Venue | Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House |
| Attendees | For the Developer Malcolm Parsons – Senior Programme Development Manager, Network Rail Anna Holbrook – Scheme Sponsor, Network Rail Liz Wood-Griffiths – Consents Manager, Network Rail Daniel O’Kelly – Principal Environmental Specialist, Jacobs Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead Katherine Chapman – Case Manager David Price – EIA Manager Oliver Lowe – Consents Services Unit Manager Wendy Maden – Assistant Case Officer |
| Meeting objectives | Meeting to discuss Western Rail Link to Heathrow project |
| Circulation | All attendees |

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

Following introductions, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) advised on its openness policy that any advice given would be recorded and placed on the National Infrastructure Planning Portal website under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended (PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 does not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) can rely.

The developer briefly explained the history and purpose of the project and provided an overview of the preferred route and progress made to date. The anticipated submission date was now likely to be early 2016 and not September 2015 as previously advised. The developer noted that they are considering the composition of their Development Consent Order (DCO) whilst having regard to any relevant Permitted Development Rights.

PINS strongly encouraged an early clarification of the description of development and all the works (principal and associated) that should be covered by a DCO application.

Subsequently, defining a red line boundary that would include any off-site elements provides for a clearer and consistent basis for consultation and environmental work, in particular if a scoping request is submitted to PINS.

The developer suggested that compulsory acquisition powers were likely to be included within a DCO. PINS noted the benefits of identifying persons with an interest in the land early on in the process to allow for relevant statutory consultation.

The developer outlined their current programme with key milestones and then discussed potential options in terms of statutory and non-statutory consultation and the appropriate timings thereof. PINS strongly suggested that the developer seek to avoid any overlap between the developer's s42 consultation and the consultation that PINS undertakes in order to provide a Scoping Opinion; in other cases this had caused confusion.

The developer discussed issues relevant to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, including the procedural requirements in respect of requests for a scoping opinion. The developer was advised to engage with PINS at the earliest opportunity in advance of any scoping request. A brief discussion was held regarding the approach to cumulative assessment and other reasonably foreseeable projects in the area. PINS advised that such matters will require assessment within the Environmental Statement and that PINS will provide further advice in any scoping opinion issued.

The developer noted that the elements that they intend to consult on prior to statutory consultation under s42 were highway alignment, tunnel alignment and access routes. PINS encouraged the developer to be as clear as possible in consultation material about any relevant history and evolution of the scheme as currently being proposed.

The developer confirmed discussions were being undertaken with relevant local authorities on the approach to Community Consultation. PINS noted the benefit of discussions with Local Authorities regarding the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime timetabling and their resource implications at an early stage. Furthermore, early discussion with a local authority/ies regarding any requirements in the DCO was highly beneficial.

PINS also noted the benefits of on-going discussions with statutory undertakers about any suggested protective provisions.

The developer indicated that the name of the scheme may be subject to change; it was agreed that they would up-date PINS as soon as practicable after any decision was taken.

The Consents Service Unit (CSU) explained their potential role in assisting with gaining the necessary consents outside of the PA2008 regime. CSU highlighted the benefits of identifying the other necessary consents and beginning these discussions during the pre application period.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- Melanie Bischer of CSU to contact developer regarding other consents
- Propose an up-date teleconference in January