

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Metrowest1](#)
Cc: [NI Enquiries](#)
Subject: Fwd: FAO MetroWest Phase 1 Case Team - Your Ref: TR040011
Date: 02 March 2021 11:52:53
Attachments: [Web Page.pdf](#)

[REDACTED]

Thank you for forwarding Richard Guyatts email which I have reviewed the have now found the revised 2017 proposal regarding access from Chapel Pill Lane which states a temporary compound and permanent access for maintenance, copy attached at the end of my email.

Whilst I understand the reason for the change of access required the proposal states this is a temporary compound and therefore, I cannot understand why a permanent road surface such as tarmac would be required.

Previously in 1999/2000 the railway used this access and had a temporary compound to open the railway up for freight trains. At this time, they used hardcore and had no issue with vehicles accessing the site. The railway was supposed to remove when the works were complete, but the landowner refused to have this removed and later applied for planning to retain the track and provide disabled parking at the bottom of the hill.

Planning was refused on the basis that this was inappropriate use of greenbelt land. with rolling countryside and without structures. Appeal was made and a final decision supporting this was made on the 12 June 2002, Appeal Ref: APP/? 0121/A/02/1083742.

I cannot see that anything has since 2002 and with the completion of the development at the old Ham Green Hospital site (a brownfield site) the wildlife at Chapel Pill Lane and surrounding the lake has continued to flourish. Which can be viewed on the Friends of the Lake Facebook page.

Whilst the contractors may use the field for a temporary compound and parking vehicles etc. To access the rail track they will still require access via Hayes Mayes Lane as this runs across the top of the tunnel and provides a walkway down to the platform and access to the tunnel.

I was please to read that there will no permanent lighting and would suggest as previously suggested MetroWest use Hardcore as this will reduce the impact on the environment and greenbelt landscape.

I was surprised to read in your interim response that this was a planning request by North Somerset Council as I was led to believe that MetroWest were applying. It appears to be a conflict of interest when both the applicant and the approver are both North Somerset and with the local Land Trust appear to be the parties pushing for the change of road surface. I am sure of Network Rail were applying for planning to access and the compound this would not be a consideration as throughout the consultation process, they have been keen to keep any impact to the area to an absolute minimum

Finally, I note that Richard states that **“MetroWest is not supporting or facilitating the Community Land Trust’s proposals. We have provided our plans to the CLT to allow the CLT to take in to account MetroWest’s proposals when working up the CLT’s scheme proposals. The Community Land Trust proposals will be a matter for the North Somerset Local Planning Authority to determine”**. However, at the last Parish Council Murray Stewart, Pill Community Land Trust confirmed he had been liaising with MetroWest and good progress had been made with several caveats to meet he did not elaborate further which would suggest to the contrary.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]