

Meeting Note

File reference	WW010001
Status	Draft
Author	Amy Cooper

Meeting with	Thames Water (TW)
Meeting date	22 December 2011
Attendees (IPC)	Jessica Potter Mark Wilson Lynne Franklin Pauleen Lane (Apologies – Nik Perepelov)
Attendees (non IPC)	Ian Fletcher Keith Farley Ingrid Lagerberg Nicola White James Goode
Location	5th Floor Temple Quay House, Temple Quay, Bristol

Meeting purpose	A project update and discussion about how to present information in application documents.
------------------------	---

Summary of key points discussed and advice given	<p>Introductions In preparation for the organisational changes taking place in April 2012, the IPC has been restructured into specialist teams. Mark Wilson has been appointed as Head of Water, waste water & waste therefore future correspondence relating to this project should be directed to Mark.</p> <p>Plans The use of colour on plans and drawings was discussed. The IPC advised that colour could be used as a visual enhancement to aid communication. However, to minimise costs for interested persons who may wish to photocopy plans in black & white, shading may be more appropriate.</p> <p>In compliance with the APFP Regs, TW intend to use a 1:1250 scale.</p> <p>The IPC advised that a plan illustrating the subsoil development would be helpful from a communication perspective particularly when used in conjunction with the Book of Reference.</p> <p>TW noted that highway stoppages and access elements etc. will be described in articles' of the draft DCO. TW therefore questioned the need for access plans to be submitted as part of</p>
---	--

the application. The IPC advised that a plan described in the APFP Reg 5(k) would assist the Examining authority in certifying the accuracy of what is described in the draft DCO and help enforcement authorities ascertain if access routes have been adhered to.

TW questioned if the land plan could be enhanced with information about the intended works. The IPC is unable to exercise its discretion on this matter; however, the APFP Regs state that two distinctive plans (a works plan and a land plan) may accompany the application.

TW have debated about how to list associated development in the draft DCO. TW intend to include this information within the same schedule which describes the main works (i.e. shaft and connection tunnel works). An asterix will be used to differentiate between the development types. This site led approach could be used to adopt a numbering system for relevant plans. The IPC concluded that this is a sensible approach.

Consultation Report

To minimise repetition TW may opt to display consultation responses by issue type. It was noted that late responses to consultation have been taken into account.

TW intend to submit a consultation report with appendices' which detail what took place during phase 1 and 2.

The IPC advised that the status of the application (i.e. that the draft s14(3) Order has not yet been designated) should be described upfront in the consultation report. To assist the reader, accurate terminology should be used throughout the report.

Outreach

The IPC stated that once the application has been submitted, Local authorities (LAs) have 14 days to respond on the adequacy of consultation. To ensure LAs adhere to this tight deadline, we advise that internal preparations are made prior to our invitation. TW noted that LAs are unfamiliar with the PA2008 process and to raise awareness it was suggested that another outreach event be held in March.

Draft Documents

TW intend to submit a draft DCO to the IPC in March. The IPC advised that TW submit a draft explanatory memorandum and environmental statement to assist our understanding of the application.

The IPC enquired if a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be necessary. TW noted that part of the Thames estuary is a Special Protection Area (SPA) therefore they will scope to establish if a HRA is required. The IPC advised that TW discusses their findings with Natural England (NE) and reach an agreement on the effects on the European site.

	S150 of PA2008 states that certain prescribed consents can be included in a DCO <i>if</i> the relevant consenting body agrees to their inclusion. The IPC noted that NE wish to retain their license authentication functions. Further information on this matter is being drafted and will be included as an Annex in Advice Note 11.
--	--

Specific decisions/ follow up required?	TW to establish the appropriate terminology for different boundaries. IPC to check previous s51 advice given in relation to combining plans.
--	---

Circulation List	