

**From:** [Les Stevens](#)  
**To:** [A303 Sparkford To Ilchester](#)  
**Cc:** [Les Stevens](#)  
**Subject:** A303 - FAO Ms L Coffey Lead Inspector  
**Date:** 19 March 2019 16:15:17  
**Attachments:** [Parish Council"s response to PINS following ISH Action Point Responses at Deadline 4 19 03 19 Final.pdf](#)

---

Dear Ms. Coffey,

Please see the attached letter from the Parish Councils of Queen Camel, Sparkford and West Camel.

Yours sincerely.

Les Stevens  
Clerk to West Camel Parish Council

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

## **PARISH COUNCILS OF QUEEN CAMEL, SPARKFORD AND WEST CAMEL**

Triscombe  
Fore St  
West Camel  
Somerset  
BA22 7QW

clerk@westcamel.org.uk

18<sup>th</sup> March 2019

Ms L Coffey  
Lead Member of the Panel of Examining Inspectors  
The Planning Inspectorate  
National Infrastructure Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

Dear Ms Coffey,

### **Highways England response to Hearing Action Points at Deadline 4**

On behalf of the Parish Councils of Queen Camel, Sparkford and West Camel, I have been asked to write to you regarding the veracity and accuracy of the responses provided by Highways England's to Hearing Action Points 1 and 12 in their Deadline 4 Submission.

**Hearing Action Point 1** – You clearly requested the Applicant to provide you with a “Note of informal discussions with MOD in relation to landholdings” with copies of emails and meeting notes in response to their statement that they had in fact engaged informally with the MOD to acquire a portion of land to more comfortably accommodate the Local Parallel Road (LPR).

All that has been provided is an amended statement in the SoCG with the MOD, which actually proves nothing.

*‘19 March 2018 to 3 April 2018 E-mails Proposed parallel road and the possible impact on the MOD signalling station had been discussed and asked feedback from the MOD safeguarding team.’*

There is, as far as we can tell, no further mention of the subject after this initial contact. By comparison, acquisition of land to re-route a footpath has been an iterative debate. This leads us to the view that the Applicant has not properly considered the PLR proposal from the outset.

**Hearing Action Point 12** – You requested the Applicant produce a drawing overlaying the Parish Council's proposed amended design over the Applicant's existing design. The Applicant stated that they would require copies of the plans previously supplied by the Parish Councils in a CAD format. The Parish Councils undertook to provide these drawings and a Deadline 4 submission of the overlay plan by the Applicant was agreed.

The Parish Councils provided the requisite drawings by 27<sup>th</sup> February (copied to PINS), receipt of which was acknowledged by Chris Setters on behalf of the Applicant.

You will understand our collective disbelief on reading the Applicant's response to Hearing Action Point 12 as part of their Deadline 4 (8<sup>th</sup> March) submission –

### **Action Point 12**

*1.2.33 Action Point 12 requests: Drawing showing OS Base, Proposal and Parish Council proposal on single drawings.*

*1.2.34 The Applicant is awaiting further information from the Parish Councils in relation to their proposal which the Applicant understands is being submitted at Deadline 4. The Applicant will respond to this in full at Deadline 5.*

This response (1.2.34) is at best curious and evasive and seems unprofessional as the fact is that the drawings were already in the possession of the Applicant. The Applicant appears to show scant regard for the requests made by you, the Inspectorate Team, and to be paying 'lip-service' to the process, as they seem to have no intention of amending their design as submitted.

The fact that the Parish Councils have been able, despite their comparatively minuscule resources and funding, to comply with and meet the deadline request set by you, amplifies the seemingly low importance placed on this process by the Applicant.

We appreciate that we do have some fundamental differences with the Applicant over a few design issues, and indeed have, as unpaid representatives of the communities bordering this development, striven to remain constructive and professional throughout the DCO examination process, we ask that the Applicant does so as well.

Yours sincerely

*Les Stevens*

Les Stevens - Clerk to West Camel Parish Council  
On behalf of the Parish Councils of Queen Camel, West Camel and Sparkford.