



National  
Infrastructure  
Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000  
e-mail: A303SparkordtoIlchester@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Highways England, Mr Bryan Norman,  
Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
and all Interested Parties

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR010036

Date: 4 June 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

**Planning Act 2008 (as amended) – Section 89**

**The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) – Rule 17**

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

**Examining Authority’s request for further information**

The Examining Authority (ExA) has now received the Deadline 7 submissions and seeks further information/clarification in relation to a number of matters.

The questions set out below are directed to Bryan Norman, The Applicant, and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). However, this does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests. Please respond by **Deadline 8, Monday 10 June 2019**

Mr Bryan Norman	Reference is made to the Mount Cook case. Please provide the legal reference and/or full title of the case and briefly explain why the judgement referred to is considered to be relevant to this application for development consent.
Mr Bryan Norman	Please provide details of the number of vehicles using the A359, including the number of vehicles at different times of day and the location of the survey points, together with any other relevant information in relation to the survey.
The Applicant	The ExA notes that there have been recent updates to DMRB. Could the Applicant confirm whether the

	<p>references to DMRB in both the ES and any subsequent submissions refer to the latest version and that it does not seek to rely on any section that have been subsequently withdrawn or superseded.</p> <p>Does the Applicant wish to comment on any of the sections published and/or updated in May 2019?</p>
The Applicant	<p>DMRB Volume 0, Part 5, <i>GD300 Requirements for new and upgraded all-purpose trunk roads (expressways)</i> and <i>CD239 Footway and cycleway pavement design</i> were published in May 2019. The former provides the design requirements and advice for new and upgraded all-purpose trunk roads (expressways). What are the implications of these documents for the proposal?</p>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	<p>The Ministry of Defence has agreed to the provision of a footpath on Crown Land alongside the southern boundary of the site at Camel Hill to link Gason Lane and Traits Lane. The ExA has received representations from a number of bodies, including the South Somerset Bridleways Association, that this should be a bridleway rather than a footpath.</p> <p>The Applicant, Highways England, has stated that the Ministry is only willing to accept this as a footpath and it is suggested that a bridleway is unacceptable for security reasons.</p> <p>Could the Ministry please explain whether this is the case, and if so, why the use of the route as a bridleway would give rise to security concerns when use as a footpath would not.</p>
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)	<p>Potential Bird Strike. The Applicant advises that discussions are continuing with a view to limiting the risk of bird strike to an acceptable level and that this matter will be addressed within the SoCG. Notwithstanding it would be helpful to the ExA's consideration of this matter if the DIO would provide the information requested below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An indication of usual flight paths for aircraft using RNAS Yeovilton.</li> <li>• Given the proximity of ponds 1 to 4 to RNAS Yeovilton, and the size of pond 5, could the DIO please comment on whether any modifications to the design of these ponds, including alterations to their size and number, and planting would be likely to adequately mitigate the risk of bird strike.</li> <li>• Please advise as to any limitations as to the</li> </ul>

	<p>maximum size and depth of the proposed ponds that would be necessary in order to minimise the risk of bird strike.</p>
The Applicant	<p>Please supply a tracked change version of the following documents from the previously submitted versions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline Environmental Management Plan (Please note the contents page also appears to need amending so that it is consistent with contents of the document)</li> <li>• Biodiversity Offsetting Metric</li> <li>• Statement of Reasons</li> <li>• Environmental Statement Table of Errata</li> </ul>
The Applicant	<p>In respect of Bund 7 could the Applicant please explain why the drainage arrangement could not be redesigned so that the two culverts are moved to the east, thus allowing Bund 7 to be extended eastward, or why the proposed culverts could not be extended in length to allow an extension of Bund 7 overhead, or why an attenuation pond could not be included on the southside of the main carriageway to avoid the need for the culverts to the north.</p> <p>If an extension of Bund 7 is not technically feasible, could the Applicant set out what alternative screening measures it has considered and why the environmental barrier (albeit a wooden fence) has been chosen.</p>

Yours faithfully

*Lesley Coffey*

Lesley Coffey

**Lead Member of the Panel of Examining Inspectors**

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.