



Meeting note

File reference	TR010034
Status	FINAL
Author	Robert Ranger
Date	6 February 2018
Meeting with	Highways England
Venue	Teleconference
Attendees	Highways England (HE) Myles Cotton Andrew Dawson Alison Poytress Chris Sadat-Shafae Amarjit Doow-Powell The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead Rob Ranger – Case Manager
Meeting objectives	Consultation update meeting
Circulation	All

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

The Planning Inspectorate explained the duties placed upon it under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) (the PA2008). A note of the meeting would be taken recording the key points discussed and any advice issued by the Planning Inspectorate. The note would be published on the Planning Inspectorate's website. Any advice issued by the Planning Inspectorate would not constitute legal advice upon which the Applicant, or others, could rely.

Consultation Update

HE has issued S47 and S48 stakeholder letters. As the result of an error in the stated opening times of a deposit location, they have republished their S48 notice with a correction. This does not affect the deadline for responses, which exceeds 28 days. The Inspectorate advised HE to make the narrative clear in their Consultation Report.

A consultation leaflet has been sent to 23000 addresses. Consultation materials will be uploaded to the project website on Monday 12 February 2018.

The Inspectorate asked if any issues had emerged during HE's consultation on the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). There were no comments on the SoCC that were not accepted. HE explained that Tameside MBC had requested that additional deposit locations be added to the list, this was not added to the SOCC, but was placed on the S48 notices advertised, commenting that "Additional deposit locations within Tameside"

The Inspectorate asked if HE were aware of any potential concerns regarding the adequacy of their consultation. HE confirmed that they were not aware of any at this time.

HE explained that the element of the scheme in the Peak District National Park will not be taken forward. The scheme has reduced in scope since the non-statutory consultation undertaken in 2017.

The Inspectorate noted the consultation material also related to elements of the scheme that were not to be consented via a Development Consent Order (DCO) but were being taken forward under other consenting regimes, for example the Westwood Roundabout. HE explained that they did not currently intend to report on consultation responses relating to those elements in their Consultation Report. Regard will be had to those responses, which will inform the development of the elements of the proposals to which they relate.

The Inspectorate noted that this approach had the potential to give rise to submissions to any examination that relate to wider network issues or to those elements of the project that are not the subject of the DCO application. The Inspectorate asked if the Preliminary Environmental Information Report related to the entire project, or only to those elements subject of the DCO application. HE confirmed that it related only to those elements that were subject of the DCO application.

Actions

The Inspectorate asked if any consultation materials showed the red-line DCO boundary. HE agreed to respond on the point by email.

HE to respond to the query in respect of the contents of the PEIR

The Inspectorate asked if Highpeak Borough was within the consultation boundary. HE agreed to respond on the point by email.

HE and the Inspectorate agreed to arrange a further meeting in mid-April.