

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](mailto:A303Stonehenge)
Subject: EA's general questions arising from the DCO : COGS Response to Tr.1.20
Date: 01 May 2019 23:13:48

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Case Team
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House Bristol BS1 6PN
By email: A303Stonehenge@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

The Planning Act 2008 Section 89 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 8, 13 and 16 Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Examination Timetable and procedure

Dear Sir/Madam

Please find below answers to questions addressed to COGS (Cycling Opportunities Group for Salisbury) and other stakeholders

Yours faithfully,

Gillian Anlezark (COGS Committee member)

Tr.1.20 Road Safety – Walking, cycling and horses

i. Paragraph 7.2.3 of the TA refers to proposed provision of Pegasus crossings at Longbarrow south roundabout. On the A360 road and on the former A303, Kent carriage gates will be provided at all access points to link prevent access by motor vehicles. Do the stakeholders consider that this satisfactorily addresses the needs of NMUs in this location?

Pegasus crossing

The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges <http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmrb/vol5/section2/ta9105.pdf> Volume 5 Section 2 Part 4 TA 91/05 Provision for Non-Motorised Users Chapter 6 Crossings recommends "6.42 This is a signal controlled crossing for use by ridden horses. Signal controlled equestrian crossings are not combined with pedestrian and/or cycle crossings in order to avoid potential conflicts. If there is a requirement to provide facilities for other NMUs, these should be installed in parallel. Microwave detectors can also be used on the crossing to extend traffic times. 6.43 Holding areas should be provided within the verge " A Pegasus crossing will be appropriate for equestrians, but a parallel toucan crossing should be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to avoid conflict and increase safety of all users.

Kent carriage gates

Access controls have been reviewed by Sustrans https://www.sustrans.org.uk/sites/default/files/file_content_type/access_control_guide_jan_2012.pdf Section 7.7 LAYOUT & DESIGN SOLUTIONS describes various types of access control and their effectiveness in preventing illegal access by various types of vehicle and on legitimate users. The Kent carriage gap is the only solution that will effectively prevent access by motor vehicles without hampering use by all other types of NMU. There is no access control that will prevent illegal use of a right of way by motorcycles without impeding legitimate use by some NMUs. The small central bollards could be trip hazards especially for partially sighted people and collision hazards for cyclists, so need to be easily distinguishable from the background. They may need to have reflective surfaces for use during darkness hours.

ii. Paragraph 7.2.4 of the TA refers to risks to personal safety, particularly for wheel chair users. Is it acceptable not to provide lighting to underpasses because they are in a rural area and not on lit routes?

I have no specialist information on this point, but, since the tunnel and roundabouts will be lit, I cannot see a problem with lighting underpasses for NMUs in order to increase personal safety.

iii. What if any provision is intended to be made for a safe north-south crossing of the A303 at the western end of the scheme at Yarnbury Castle, as sought by Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council?

We would support Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council in requesting a safe crossing for NMUs at this point where new bridleways end at the PRow on each side of the A303 carriageway but the only safe crossing point between the north and south side is at Green Bridge 1, about 2 km to the east.