

From: Malcolm Tice <malcolmtice14@gmail.com>
Sent: 14 November 2020 15:32
To: Tudor, Sarah <sarah.tudor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: URGENT - DPI/G1250/20/9 Bournemouth and Swanage Ferry Fees Inquiry

Good Afternoon Sarah

I am surprised that the Inspector has decided to postpone the Inquiry on the basis of the submission by DCC etc as this is only tinkering with the submission by the Applicant and allows greater projected tolls than already sought by the Applicant. I question the motives of DCC etc as I do not feel that they are serving the interests of residents of Dorset and other ferry users sensibly.

On the basis of your email to Nick Boulter I have decided to place on record the various papers that I will be speaking to as part of my objections to the proposed increases being sought by the Applicant. This also includes a counter proposal that there should be no increase in tolls for the next 12 years as there will be sufficient funds available to both replace the ferry and pay reasonable dividends to the shareholder of the Applicant.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Malcolm Tice

On Fri, 13 Nov 2020 at 08:31, Tudor, Sarah <sarah.tudor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk> wrote:

Good Morning

The Inspector dealing with the application made by the Bournemouth-Swanage Motor Road and Ferry Company has asked me to write to you.

She has, very recently, received a suggested alternative toll regime from a consortium of Councils (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council, Dorset Council and Swanage Town Council) who are working together in response to the application by the ferry company. The Inspector is content, having regard to the provisions of Section 6(2) of the transport Charges &c. (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1954, that the submitted document can be accepted to the Inquiry. She is mindful though, that should the Secretary of State take that alternative proposal into account, not all those who may have an interest in the outcome of the decision will have had the opportunity to review the alternative regime before it is discussed at the Inquiry. In the interest of natural justice therefore, the Inspector considers that the submission will need to be subject to some form of consultation, with time allowed for the applicant to consider any responses received. In order to allow time for that, the Inquiry will need to adjourn at some point. The Inspector wishes to stress that that is not to be taken as indicating that she has any views one way or the other on the alternative regime. Rather, she will need to hear informed views on it in order to be able to report to the Secretary of State. The applicant will also need time to properly consider the submission and any implications that arise from it.

The Inspector's current thinking, on a without prejudice basis, is to open the Inquiry as planned at 09.30 on Monday morning. She will take appearances and run through the formalities and then explain the proposed course of action set out above. She will then take any questions on procedural matters and ask for any views on the suggested way forward. On the basis of the information that is before her at the present time however, she then anticipates adjourning the Inquiry, without hearing any evidence, to allow for a period of consultation. The Inquiry would then resume at a later date and would proceed to hear evidence on both schemes. The likely date for resumption of the Inquiry would be Tuesday 5 January, again proceeding as a virtual event.

I would just stress again, that the above arrangements are suggested by the Inspector on a without prejudice basis.

Kind Regards

Sarah

Sarah Tudor

The Planning Inspectorate

3A Eagle Wing

Temple Quay House

2 The Square

Temple Quay

Bristol

BS1 6PN

Tel: 0303 444 5572