

**From:** [McAllister, Jo](#)  
**To:** [A303SparkfordtoIlchester@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:A303SparkfordtoIlchester@pins.gsi.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** [Woodhouse, Helen](#); [Harries, Beth](#); [Klemperer, Bill](#); [South West Casework](#)  
**Subject:** Sparkford DCO - Responses to Examiner's Questions  
**Date:** 03 May 2019 17:03:13  
**Attachments:** [A303 DCO Examiners Questions 250419\\_HBMCE responses.pdf](#)

---

Dear Sir/ Madam,

**Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling**

**Reference: SPIL-SP0005 and 2001-4933**

Please find attached HBMCE's Responses to the Examiners Questions issued on 25/04/18.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of our response.

Yours faithfully,

Jo McAllister

Heritage at Risk Landscape Architect  
South West & West Midlands Region  
Direct Line: 0117 9750696  
Mobile: [REDACTED]

Historic England, 29 Queen Square, Bristol BS1 4ND  
[www.HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://www.HistoricEngland.org.uk)



We are the public body that helps people care for, enjoy and celebrate England's spectacular historic environment, from beaches and battlefields to parks and pie shops.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

---

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

---



Historic England

**RESPONSES TO EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S  
QUESTIONS 25/04/19**

**ON BEHALF OF THE  
HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND MONUMENTS COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND  
(HISTORIC ENGLAND)  
("HBMCE")**

**Application by  
Highways England for an Order granting Development Consent for the A303  
Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling**

**PINS Reference No: SPIL-SP0005 & 2001-4933**

**HBMCE Reference No: PL00285449**

## **INTRODUCTION**

1.1. The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England is generally known as Historic England. However due to the potential for confusion in relation to “HE” (Highways England and Historic England), we have used “HBMCE” in our formal submissions to the examination to avoid confusion.

1.2. HBMCE’s creation and role in relation to the historic environment is detailed in Section 2 of our written representations, dated 23/01/19.

## **HBMCE’s RESPONSES TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY FURTHER WRITTEN QUESTIONS ISSUED ON 25 APRIL 2019**

### **3.1 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**

#### **3.1.3 Camel Hill SAM**

In light of the additional information on the distance between the limits of deviation and the Camel Hill SAM as shown in Figure 1.1 of the Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Further Written Questions [REP5-025]. Could the Applicant and Historic England please indicate the degree of harm within the analysis set out in the NPSNN to the Camel Hill SAM that they consider the proposal would create?

#### **HBMCE response**

Following review of the additional information provided by the Applicant, as mentioned above, and the archaeological evaluation and geophysical survey reports HMBCE is in agreement with the Applicant’s assessment provided in Volume 6.1 Environmental Statement. That is the Construction Effects outlined in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage Statement Table 6.4, and the assessment that there will be no significant effects during Operation, hence its non-inclusion in Table 6.5.

With regard to that the Construction Effects, HBMCE has advised the Applicant to consult us again on the detailed WSI and contractor method statement prior to them being formalised. We have been consulted by the Applicant on the Outline WSI (submitted at Deadline 6) and are broadly content with the proposed approach.

### **3.1.4 Hazelgrove House RPG**

In light of the provision of the Chronology of Hazlegrove House RPG [REP5-022] what is Historic England's final analysis of the effect of the proposal on the significance of heritage assets? This question should be answered in respect of each heritage asset which is considered to be affected.

HBMCE are content with the provision of the Chronology of Hazlegrove House RPG [REP5-022]. However, the effect of the proposal on the significance of heritage assets is still under discussion between the Applicant and HBMCE. The response from both parties is subject to the outcome of the decision by the Examining Authority in relation to the non-material change request, relating to the southern end of the RPG, as this will influence how discussions are concluded. We are not, therefore, in a position to deliver our final analysis.

## **3.5 Landscape and Visual Effects**

### **3.5.4 Landscape effects on LCA2 Hazlegrove**

In the draft SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England [REP5-016] there is reference to the consideration of the scale of effect on the LCA2 Hazelgrove being under discussion.

Could the parties please explain fully their latest positions?

#### **HBMCE response**

The scale of effect on the LCA2 Hazelgrove is still under discussion between the Applicant and HBMCE. The response from both parties is subject to the outcome of the decision by the Examining Authority in relation to the non-material change request, relating to the southern end of the RPG, as this will influence how discussions are concluded.

### **3.5.5 Landscape effects on LCA2 Hazlegrove**

In the draft SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England [REP5-016] there is disagreement between the parties over the effects of consideration of View 38.

a) Could Historic England confirm whether it agrees with the Applicant's consideration of the effect as set out in its review of this visual receptor within Appendix E of the Deadline 4 Report (REP4-018)?

b) If not, could Historic England set out its justification for a different level of effect?

**HBMCE response**

The effect on visual receptor 38 is still under discussion between the Applicant and HBMCE. The response from both parties is subject to the outcome of the decision by the Examining Authority in relation to the non-material change request, relating to the southern end of the RPG, as this will influence how discussions are concluded.