

Dear Sirs

Ref: Response re A417 Missing Link for Procedural Deadline B

Following the Planning Inspectorate Preliminary Meeting, I wish to make the following submissions regarding the Examination Process:

Meetings

You may be aware that many of the Representations made for this project are from people who live in the village of Cowley. This is partly because some villagers feel that Cowley has not been made fully aware of the impact of the proposed route, or the fact that it has been moved closer to the village.

During the Preliminary Meeting we were informed that some meetings during the Examination Process will be held locally. As the sole community that will be impacted by this route, and to help make this a fair and efficient process, can we request that at least one of these meetings, if not more, is held within the village of Cowley so that residents who don't drive etc can have the opportunity to attend in person please.

Transcripts

Within Cowley, we have some residents who don't have the internet or who are hard of hearing, and therefore need to read the transcripts. The transcript of the Preliminary Meeting is an inaccurate and unacceptable record of the Preliminary Meeting. It is riddled with mistakes and incorrect/mis-spelt names, and there are myriad examples where it doesn't make any sense at all. It is clear that it hasn't been sanity checked by a human. To ensure the same access to information is afforded to everyone during the Examination Process can the Inspectorate please provide accurate transcripts of Hearings etc, that are checked against the recordings and have correct names, etc within them.

Late Submissions

I would like to ask how this process can be considered a "fair process" when 54 late submissions have been accepted? People who made their submissions within the required time-frame made them without reading what other people had written.

The late submissions were made after the other submissions had been published; and could be written to counter-argue against the initial submissions made. I would therefore like to know how the Inspectorate deems this to be a fair or efficient process for those who followed the correct guidelines and made their submissions on time without access to what anyone else had written? Surely, to make this a fair process the correct procedure would be to disregard all late submissions?

Yours Faithfully
Joanna Pearce