



Meeting note

Project name	A303 Sparkford to Ilchester
File reference	TR010036
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	17 April 2018
Meeting with	Highways England
Venue	Mott Macdonald Offices, Bristol
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead David Price – EIA and Land Rights Manager Michael Breslaw – EIA and Land Rights Advisor The Applicant Elliot Hayes – Assistant Project Manager Will Spencer – DCO and Statutory Process Manager Alex Murphy – Project Manager (MMSJV) Doug Johnson – Communications Lead (MMSJV) Serena Gosden – Assistant Project Manager (MMSJV) Julian Boswall – Burges Salmon Mark Wilson – HE DCO Advisor (Arup)
Meeting objectives	Project Update Meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Consultation overview

The Applicant provided an overview of the preparations for the recent statutory consultation, including noting the engagement with relevant local authorities in preparing the Statement of Community Consultation.

The Applicant summarised the levels of attendance at certain events and highlighted some of the key matters arising from the consultation. Further work was being undertaken to prepare a Consultation Report that would be submitted with the application documents. The Applicant explained that work on the Consultation Report had progressed well; a draft could be shared with the Inspectorate as part of a staged approach to seeking comments on draft application documents.

The Applicant outlined the on-going dialogue with key stakeholders, noting in particular that it had provided briefings to the District and County Councils as well as relevant parish councils about the Planning Act 2008 process.

The Applicant provided a summary of discussions to date with those with an interest in land and provided an update on their proposed approach to their potential inclusion of compulsory acquisition within a Development Consent Order.

The Applicant explained its proposed approach to archaeological investigation noting that existing geophysical investigations have established the need for trial trenching. The Applicant stated that it is their intention to conduct such work prior to construction but at a point after the application for a Development Consent Order. The Inspectorate highlighted the importance of ensuring that the assessment in the ES was sufficient to satisfy the Regulations and ensure significant effects are assessed. The Inspectorate also highlighted risks associated with the proposed approach to archaeological investigation, not least the constraints of working within fixed Development Consent Order limits.

The Inspectorate briefly discussed the Applicant's proposed approach to the preparation of information for the Habitat Regulations Assessment. The Inspectorate drew the Applicant's attention to recent caselaw, being: [C-323/17 - People Over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta \(2018\)](#).

Project programme

The Applicant summarised the work programme for the next few months, noting that it was intending to enter into Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with certain key parties. The Inspectorate encouraged the Applicant to include in any SoCG areas of uncommon ground, where they had been working with a party/ organisation but ultimately had not reached full agreement on the outcome.

The Applicant outlined the future programme for the project, noting their intention to send a suite of draft documents to the Inspectorate for review and indicated a potential submission date of early July 2018. The Inspectorate suggested that it would be helpful if the documents could indicate how progressed they were.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following action was agreed:

- The project team would submit draft documents to The Inspectorate for review.