

**From:** Stuart Tarr [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 February 2021 11:42  
**To:** Metrowest1 <Metrowest1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Bunten, James <JAMES.BUNTEN@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** TR040011: Portishead Branch Line – MetroWest Phase 1 Updates: Issue Specific Hearing 5 on Environmental Matters, Thursday 5th March 2021  
**Importance:** High

Dear Bart

I would be grateful to receive an invitation to attend this meeting following what the residents I represent consider is an unsatisfactory Deadline 5 reply from the Applicant to my questions regarding alternative Hayes Mayes Lane access to the Pill Tunnel compound.

This is set out more fully in a resident's submission to the Planning Inspectorate which was accepted and published yesterday by James Bunten a member of your case team as an 'Additional Submission' to consider its content as part of the ExA's independent examination.

I will not add to that submission here beyond noting that the applicant's Deadline 5 reply was viewed as contradictory and evasive in responding to questions about the Applicant's role in permitting shared MetroWest access to the site which has been confirmed by the Vice Chairman of the Pill and District Community Land Trust in an email to me dated 23rd February, to quote:

*I do have a full understanding of the position with Metro West as I have been in discussion with them for a number of years. I am not sure why you are so concerned about it as it is a matter between the CLT and Metro West which will then be taken forward if and when we get planning permission. Metro West have confirmed to us that they will not deny us permission provided we meet certain conditions, indeed they will be required to provide access to the retained element of that private land, whoever owns it, throughout their works and upon completion.*

In consideration of which, in support of the resident's additional submission, I would request the ExA to require the Applicant to produce full disclosure of all correspondence, the notes of meetings and discussion between MetroWest, North Somerset Council and the Pill and District Community Land Trust, to explain why they have made this significant change, that will lead to the over-development and urbanisation of this site in excess of Network Rail's engineering and emergency access needs.

I note that the Lead Planning Inspector has still to decide whether a further unaccompanied site visit is required in respect of which the residents do not accept WBD's assertion at page 7 of the written response that *"the separate representation of the Council as planning*

*authority and the Council as applicant demonstrates the separation of responsibilities is well understood by North Somerset Council", but does takes comfort from Womble Bond Dickinson's recommendation that a site visit to Chapel Pill Lane would be appropriate.*

In any event, whatever is finally decided in relation to a site visit, whether accompanied or not, the residents would expect the ExA to conduct a thorough independent review of the disclosure of correspondence to shed light on the nature of the relationship between North Somerset Council as the Applicant for the MetroWest project and its role as the facilitator for the Pill and District Community Land Trust in allowing PDCLT's request for shared access to the Chapel Pill Lane site to permit a housing development to proceed.

Yours sincerely

Stuart

Stuart Tarr

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

t: [Redacted]

m: [Redacted]

e: [Redacted]