

**From:** Andrew Harding <[miagltd@outlook.com](mailto:miagltd@outlook.com)>

**Sent:** 24 May 2023 23:08

**To:** A12chelmsfordA120 <[A12chelmsfordA120@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:A12chelmsfordA120@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Proposed meeting between MIAG/McIPC and National Highways - SOCG Junction 24 - 25.05

Unique reference numbers;

20032843

A12CSP016

20032841

To The Examining Authority.

Please see final exchange between the parties concerning the SOCG for Junction 24, and we request this be posted to the PINS site. The email is directly addressed to lawyers for National Highways.

Thank you

**Messing and Inworth Action Group Limited**

[MIAGLTD@outlook.com](mailto:MIAGLTD@outlook.com)

[www.MIAGLTD.co.uk](http://www.MIAGLTD.co.uk)

*'To successfully campaign for the Secretary of State, through the Planning Inspectorate, to accept and adopt **The Main Alternative** proposed by the Messing-cum-Inworth Parish Council'.*

Private Limited Company Registered in England and Wales no; 14109224

This email is meant for the recipient only. If you have received this in error, please delete immediately – thank you. You must not use any information or disseminate any information contained in this email.

Richard

We note that you do not propose to provide a response to our detailed concerns or amend the agenda into an acceptable format for us to reflect the issues of both parties.

To be clear, you have refused to place on the agenda the opportunity for MIAG/McIPC to raise and discuss the validity and merit of the Main Alternative.

You have declined to comment, save to say you 'do not accept criticisms', on any questions or matters we have been raising for the last several weeks. These matters include the absence of what you termed 'commonality' on both sets of documents. We believe there is no common ground between us on the SOCG, and you refuse to even discuss the Main Alternative.

There are no new initiatives or changes in either parties position. We believe that your proposed list of attendees do not hold the level of authority required to amend your documents in relation to your clients' plans for Junction 24.

We have repeatedly stated our position and are concerned that we now confront a meeting that will not assist the ExA.

In fact, we believe it to be a waste of the ExA time to review a repeat of statements made by your client with which we do not agree.

We have already advised the Chair of the Parish Council and our legal representatives to stand down. The entire meeting has no merit.

The Village Hall is no longer available as we have released the booking.

Andrew

**Messing and Inworth Action Group Limited**

[MIAGLTD@outlook.com](mailto:MIAGLTD@outlook.com)

[www.MIAGLTD.co.uk](http://www.MIAGLTD.co.uk)

*'To successfully campaign for the Secretary of State, through the Planning Inspectorate, to accept and adopt **The Main Alternative** proposed by the Messing-cum-Inworth Parish Council'.*

Private Limited Company Registered in England and Wales no; 14109224

This email is meant for the recipient only. If you have received this in error, please delete immediately – thank you. You must not use any information or disseminate any information contained in this email.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 May 2023 10:58  
**To:** Andrew Harding  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; [Messing Cum Inworth Parish Council](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed meeting between MIAG/McIPC and National Highways - SOCG - 23.05 [WBDUK-AC.FID125228777]

Andrew

Thank you for your email. Given how close we now are to the meeting I don't think there is purpose in providing a detailed response, so we simply note but do not accept the criticisms made.

The SOCG is in the basic form used by NH in common with the other SOCG on this scheme. We are seeking to provide a single approach to all these documents to assist the ExA.

The team attending on Thursday has been assembled to provide seniority and expertise appropriate to the SOCG discussion. Most A12 SOCG meetings have been run on similar lines.

It would be helpful if, prior to the meeting, you could let us have your attendee list and confirmation of how the recording of the meeting will be shared with us.

Richard

**Richard Guyatt**

Partner  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: +44 [REDACTED]  
m: +44 7968 427076  
t: +44 [REDACTED]  
e: [REDACTED]@wbd-uk.com

[Sign up for legal updates, e-newsletters and event invitations](#)



womblebond Dickinson.com



Andrew Harding <[miagltd@outlook.com](mailto:miagltd@outlook.com)>

**Sent:** 23 May 2023 17:03

**To:** Richard Guyatt [REDACTED]@wbd-uk.com>

**Cc:** Humphreys, Stephen [REDACTED]@ashfords.co.uk>

**Subject:** Proposed meeting between MIAG/McIPC and National Highways - SOCG - 23.05

Good afternoon Richard

We have your response, and note all the apologies for the various failings throughout the earlier communications and paperwork from you.

MIAG and McIPC are obviously keen to assist the ExA, and therefore feel the proposed meeting must have merit and benefit for them to observe.

You state that there is 'no commonality' with the Main Alternative. You have removed the principle purpose and founding goal of MIAG from any discussion at the meeting. Our remit is clear and is contained on every communication from us.

MIAG and McIPC feel there is 'no commonality' with your SOCG. Your client proposes to present an out of date and uncorrected document. Your statements indicate there is no preparedness to change.

Your client is seeking to have a meeting with a predetermined outcome. This is not consultation nor an attempt to seek 'common ground'.

Constantly stating that a team is 'senior' does not make it so. It is clear that whilst you could easily clarify Mr Harris as an attendee by simply asking your client, it seems Mr Davie has already committed himself elsewhere.

We do not believe your team is senior enough, and a plethora of titles without authority is unacceptable. Stating, and giving reassurances of seniority to the ExA, does not make it any more true.

It is regrettable that you refuse to amend the agenda. For your reference, it is not 'your agenda' to determine. This should be a meeting where both parties have input to the structure of the agenda,

and your view of ownership is misplaced.

You ask if MIAG/McIPC has changed its position. We have not. We have attached hereto the document presented to the ExA in early February, (your client already has this), which clearly sets out our unchanged position.

It is your client that has been forced, several times, to change their position after overwhelming evidence proved them wrong or at fault.

Our request for five clear days advance submissions for accurate paperwork, a valuable agenda and notification of attendees that can authorise change, is perfectly reasonable.

MIAG and McIPC stand ready, as we have consistently and unfailingly done, to have a meaningful meeting.

We await your reply.

Messing and Inworth Action Group Limited

[MIAGLTD@outlook.Com](mailto:MIAGLTD@outlook.Com)

[www.MIAGLTD.co.uk](http://www.MIAGLTD.co.uk)

'To successfully campaign for the Secretary of State, through the Planning Inspectorate, to accept and adopt the Main Alternative proposed by The Messing-Cum-Inworth Parish Council'

Private Limited Company Registered in England and Wales no; 14109224

This email is meant for the recipient only. If you have received this in error, please delete immediately - you must not use any information or disseminate any information contained in this email. Thank you.

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 19 May 2023 16:52

**To:** [Andrew Harding](#); [Messing Cum Inworth Parish Council](#); [REDACTED]

**Subject:** A12 - meeting in Messing, 25 May [WBUDUK-AC.FID124263388]

Dear Andrew

Many thanks for your email of 18 May 2023. My apologies for not emailing you direct previously – the usual professional protocols just kicked in. Thank you for reminding me that I should email you as well as the Parish Council and Stephen.

Dealing with your principal points:

1. The document is the current statement of common ground, with the only remaining input being to reflect your very latest submissions published earlier this week. We could update it prior to the meeting but were keen to ensure your five clear day request was met. Given the purpose of the meeting and the document we did not believe this to be material, and did not want to incorrectly interpret your latest position by rushing any additions. The updates can easily be dealt with at the meeting or immediately thereafter.

We will of course correct the name of the action group in the next iteration.

2. The purpose of a statement of common ground is to show where the parties are in agreement - and where they are not. If MIAG and McIPC's positions on points raised in their relevant representations have changed then please do update the position accordingly in the relevant column. The columns indicating MIAG's position and MCIPC's position are for MIAG and McIPC.
3. The NH team attending should be able to deal with most of the content of the statement of common ground, but it is not possible for all workstreams to be represented.
4. I am sorry that you have "little confidence" in some of the attendees – please be more specific and explain why this is, as it is both my own and my client's view that an extremely able and well experienced team has been assembled.
5. Roger Ward is a senior project manager at National Highways so I am sure he is of an appropriate level to attend. Phil Davie is unable to join us on the selected date as he is already committed elsewhere. I am not able to comment on any commitment from Mr Harris. Overall, a senior team has been put together and I would be very happy to assure the examining authority of this point.
6. Noting that you are not proposing to project the SOCG on screen, I assume we will all have to work to paper copies or our lap tops. I remain of the view that having a version on display would greatly assist the meeting attendees.
7. Next week's meeting is proposed to concentrate reviewing the parties are content their positions are accurately recorded, and hopefully identifying areas of commonality too. In that context I believe the agenda remains appropriate. There is no commonality on the Main Alternative so it does not seem necessary to pick this up at the meeting as the parties' positions are clear. Instead it remains for each party to present their case on the Main Alternative to the ExA in the examination and the SOCG can, if it is felt necessary, record the parties are not agreed on the topic.

I am therefore not proposing to resend the statement of common ground or a revised agenda at this time. If you have additional agenda points to pick up then I am happy to consider those being added to the agenda. Given the time available for our meeting a wider discussion beyond the SOCG is unlikely to be possible.

Whilst noting your intention to provide an attendee list in due course, it would be very helpful if this could be provided as soon as possible please.

Richard

**Richard Guyatt**

Partner

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: +44 [REDACTED]  
m: +44 [REDACTED]  
t: +44 345 415 0000  
e: [REDACTED]@wbd-uk.com

*[Sign up for legal updates, e-newsletters and event invitations](#)*

**From:** [Andrew Harding](#)

**Sent:** 18 May 2023 15:16

**To:** [REDACTED]@wbd-uk.com

**Cc:** [REDACTED]; [A12chelmsfordA120](#)

**Subject:** SOCG proposed meeting 25th May

Good afternoon Richard

We have now received your forwarded email. You may recall we asked that you dealt directly with the email address for MIAG in regard to this specific matter.

It is of concern that your client wishes to present an old document, as they have had 'insufficient time' to update this to include our comments. Even the name of the action group is incorrect.

We note that your client wishes to 'condense' the document. MIAG and McIPC are looking for the document to be substantively changed to reflect our position.

It is not clear from the proposed attendees whether authority and seniority exists to make such amendments. MIAG and McIPC have little confidence in some of the attendees, and note that once again only a relatively junior representative of your client plans to attend. At one point Mr Davie was suggested as an attendee, and we have an outstanding promise from Mr Harris to attend a meeting. In order to show the ExA the same degree of seriousness as both MIAG and McIPC are applying to this, perhaps this would be a good time for them to attend?

A projector to go through the repeated false narrative and an out of date document has no merit. A reiteration of your client's position is not acceptable. 100 pages that do not address the major concerns of the two villages is clearly unacceptable.

MIAG and McIPC would like to see the agenda altered to include acknowledgement of the Main Alternative and not a list of headings designed to endorse your clients position and confirmation bias.

MIAG and McIPC have made considerable efforts to arrange this meeting, and at this stage feel your proposed agenda is inadequate. We look forward to a revised version incorporating and focusing on the importance of the concerns of the action group and parish council.

We will advise both our attendee list and recording information in due course.

Please respond to the MIAG email address as previously requested.

Thank you

**Messing and Inworth Action Group Limited**

[MIAGLTD@outlook.com](mailto:MIAGLTD@outlook.com)

[www.MIAGLTD.co.uk](http://www.MIAGLTD.co.uk)

*'To successfully campaign for the Secretary of State, through the Planning Inspectorate, to accept and adopt **The Main Alternative** proposed by the Messing-cum-Inworth Parish Council'.*

Private Limited Company Registered in England and Wales no; 14109224

This email is meant for the recipient only. If you have received this in error, please delete immediately – thank you. You must not use any information or disseminate any information contained in this email.

**Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?**

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. [miaglttd@outlook.com](mailto:miaglttd@outlook.com) only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [miaglttd@outlook.com](mailto:miaglttd@outlook.com), please notify [██████████@wbd-uk.com](mailto:██████████@wbd-uk.com) as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful. Information about how we use personal data is in our [Privacy Policy](#) on our website.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is a member of Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited, which consists of independent and autonomous law firms providing services in the US, the UK, and elsewhere around the world. Each Womble Bond Dickinson entity is a separate legal entity and is not responsible for the acts or omissions of, nor can bind or obligate, another Womble Bond Dickinson entity. Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited does not practice law. Please see [██████████](#) notices for further details.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA number 449247).

*Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.*

*Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.*

*The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.*

DPC:76616c646f72



**Please consider the environment before printing this email**