



Meeting note

File reference	TR040009
Status	Final
Author	Kate Mignano
Date	20 January 2017
Meeting with	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
Venue	Telephone conference
Attendees	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Anthony Bolton Anna Holbrook Michaela Payne Malcolm Armstrong Simon White The Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest Richard Hunt Kate Mignano
Meeting objectives	Project update – Western Rail Link to Heathrow (WRLtH)
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

The Planning Inspectorate advised on its openness policy, explaining that any advice given would be recorded and placed on the Planning Inspectorate website under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Project Update

Network Rail (NR) explained how the project had progressed since the last meeting in July 2016. The baseline programme was discussed along with some scheme specific challenges such as the interrelationship with proposals for a Heathrow Express (HEX) depot in the area and updated Environment Agency guidelines regarding flood modelling. NR noted that this may impact of the current anticipated submission date and would be updating all stakeholders in due course.

Consultation (sections 42, 47 and 48)

NR confirmed comments had been received from Slough Borough Council and the London Borough of Hillingdon regarding the draft Statement of Community Consultation. Following discussions, NR commented that they may seek to review the consultation zones and venues identified by the local authorities may be used for the purposes of statutory consultation. NR confirmed they hope to hold statutory consultation under s42, 47 and 48 in Autumn 2017.

NR explained that the redline boundary of the scheme may still be subject to change and that they were aware of the importance of updated land referencing information when undertaking statutory consultation.

There was a discussion about the options for ensuring compliance with the relevant legislation should it transpire that there was a gap between the statutory consultation and submission of an application. The Inspectorate noted that there was no specified or normal timeframe expected between statutory consultation and submission, but noted that DCLG Guidance provided some options in respect of proportionate consultation (e.g. in terms of location specific issues or topics) should a proposal change and that if changes had been made as a result of consultation, it may not be necessary for an applicant to re-consult. The Inspectorate also noted the provisions of PA2008 s48 which could be used as a proportionate approach to publicising an application before submission where there had been a delay since any statutory consultation round or some degree of change had evolved the proposals.

Cumulative Effects Assessment

NR noted several other proposals in the area and discussed their in-principle approach to assessing cumulative effect in respect of each. The discussion noted an extant minerals extraction application, the proposals in respect of HS2 and Heathrow Airport and the approved DCO works to the M4 as part of the Smart Motorway scheme.

The discussion noted which of the proposals had been or would be included within the baseline assessment. The Inspectorate understood the complexity in respect of relative certainty and prospective construction timetables of the proposals mentioned. The Inspectorate noted that certain projects were not in the baseline at the moment, but stressed it would be critical to understand the approach to those developments closer to submission of a WRLtH application. The Inspectorate queried whether the cumulative effects assessment would only consider operational effects rather than construction effects. NR noted the possibility of cumulative benefits of schemes as well as considering possible apportionment between schemes.

Environmental matters

NR provided an overview of survey work undertaken to date. NR queried the options for assessment of final re-use of material arising from the project. The Inspectorate noted that if the reuse has consent in its own right then there might be justification for no further assessment of the material to its destination. However, if there was a proposal for a new site or if it would take full capacity at an existing site then the applicant may need to consider the impact on regional waste disposal capacity.

NR stated that consultees (e.g. Slough BC) have requested further ground water modelling. NR is developing a ground water conceptual site model (CSM) and will use this to inform the need for modelling.

Transport assessment

NR discussed their current work to assess modal shift resulting from the operational scheme. NR stated that they had been in discussions with consultees regarding the extent of the study area and were considering the potential need for works at other stations. NR intend to focus their assessment work on stations that would be materially affected by the change, should any such stations be identified. This would be based on consideration of the %change in numbers of users/vehicles to the stations and would adopt a base year after Crossrail was operational.

NR provided an update on Hollow Hill Lane closure and stated that the traffic data acquired during the closure was currently being analysed. The closure ends later in the month. The Transport Assessment (TA) scope was also discussed and NR stated that the TA study area would end at the point of connection with the motorway network.

Transport mitigation measures being considered by NR (in addition to the savings in terms of car journeys) include restriction of traffic routing.

Utilities

NR provided an update on the working relationships with relevant utility providers including BPA Pipelines, Affinity Water and National Grid.

Combining Documents

NR asked if the Land Plans and Works Plans could be combined. The Inspectorate advised NR to seek their own legal advice, but noted, that under Regulation 5 of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (APFP Regs) a Land Plan and Works Plan are identified under separate subsections as being required to accompany an application for Development Consent. The different purposes of the plans were discussed as well as the possible complexities which could arise at acceptance and examination as a result of combining the plans.

NR asked if the Planning Statement could be combined with a Design and Access Statement. The Inspectorate advised NR that as neither document is explicitly required under the APFP Regs to accompany a DCO application, they may be submitted under APFP Reg 5(2)q (any other documents considered necessary to support the application).

Specific decisions / follow up required?

NR noted they may have some specific follow up questions as a result of the Scoping Opinion and it was agreed that these would be sent through in written form.