

**A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross  
TR010026**

**8.12 POST HEARING SUBMISSIONS  
INCLUDING WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS  
OF ORAL CASE - ISH 3 ON WCH**

Volume 8

April 2019



## Table of Contents

	Pages
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this document	1
2 Written Summary of Case	2

### Table of Tables

Table 2-1 Written submission of oral case	2
---	---

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document sets out the Highways England (the Applicant) written summary of oral submissions made at the Issue Specific Hearing 3 on Walking, Cycling, Horse Riding issues for the A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross scheme, which took place at the Old Bakery Studios in Truro on Thursday 4 April 2019.

## 2 Written Summary of Case

Table 2-1 Written submission of oral case

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
2a	<p>There have been some changes to the rights of way and access plans following on from the Section 51 advice. Can the applicant briefly update on the proposed changes in this respect.</p> <p>Has there been any work to identify any effects on non-motorised users (NMUs) in the locations where it is proposed to remove restricted byways, which were part of the main carriageways, from the dDCO?</p>	<p><u>Update on Proposed Changes</u></p> <p>The Applicant has removed references from Schedule 4 of the <b>draft DCO</b> (dDCO) (Document Reference 3.1(B)) [AS-031] and the <b>Rights of Way and Access Plans</b> [Document Reference 2.5(A)] [AS-022 - AS-030]. These changes are outlined in item 54 of Annex A of the Response to Section 51 advice cover letter [AS-004].</p> <p>The removed restricted byways are part of main carriageways therefore do not require their own reference.</p> <p><u>Effects on NMUs</u></p> <p>The Applicant made the changes simply to correct discrepancies between the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Schedule 4 Part 2 of the dDCO, with the removal of the restricted byways that are part of the main carriageways. This has not resulted in any changes to the level of provision for non-motorised users. All that has changed is how the NMU routes in question are presented in the dDCO.</p> <p>Outside of the underpass and off-carriageway restricted byways at Chiverton, equestrians would use the new carriageway.</p>
2b	<p>Any matters arising from the CC Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-010] comment on Rights of Way and Access Plans Sheet 1-ref. Z11, asking whether there could there be an additional length of path to join BOAT 309/25/7 on the north side of the bypass to increase connectivity. It is noted that in the response to section 51 Advice [AS-004] the applicant proposes to remove Z11 from the dDCO.</p>	<p>As explained in reference to agenda item 2a, an amendment was made to the dDCO to remove Z11 from Schedule 4 and include it as part of the new B3277 highway, however, the link is still provided.</p> <p>The link is proposed specifically for eastbound cyclists wishing to leave the A30 and travel north on the B3277 to St Agnes. This shortens the distance and avoids the proposed Chiverton Junction</p> <p>As per Highway's England's <b>Comments on Local Impact Report</b> (Document Reference 8.5) [REP2-021], a connection between Z11 and BOAT 309/25/7 could lead to a safety issue of cyclists travelling</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		westbound on the eastbound A30 and therefore was not included as part of the scheme.
2c	Any matters arising from the CC LIR [REP1-010] comment on Rights of Way and Access Plans Sheet 3-ref. Z (PR5), asking whether this be upgraded to bridleway status rather than footpath.	<p>As stated in Highway's England's <b>Comments on Local Impact Report</b> (Document Reference 8.5) [REP2-021], PR5 is a stepped footpath to reduce the distance for walkers on the BR314/65/1 to the footways at the Chybucca junction.</p> <p>PR4 provides a connection between BR314/64/1 and BR314/65/1 without having to use the B3284, as discussed with Cornwall Council's Public Rights of Way (PRoW) officer and the horse riding user groups (Cornwall Countryside Access Forum (CCAF), Ramblers Association and British Horse Society). It is not considered that horses would need to use the new stepped connection PR5 as they can access further west from the new PR4 and this is considered an insignificant increase for journeys on horse.</p> <p>PR5 will not be upgraded to a bridleway as part of the scheme.</p>
2d	Any matters arising from the St Allen Parish Council [REP1-027] comment regarding the section of the Shortlanesend road from St Fredas to Two Burrow Hill, which forms part of the National Cycle Path (route no. 32). The suggestion is to redesignate this section as a bridleway. This route was also referred to by CCAF [RR-067].	<p>As part of the Public Rights of Way Management Plan in Annex M of the <b>Outline CEMP Annexes</b> (Document Reference 6.4(A)), it is proposed that the National Cycle Network (NCN) continues to pass under the A30 via the Two Barrows underbridge. The route would then follow the realigned existing A30 west which would connect with the unnamed road C0364.</p> <p>The route has been designed in this way due to highways safety, visibility from the junction and the need to cross the realigned A30 should the NCN continue on its current alignment. The proposed layout has been agreed with Cornwall Council, with no issues raised in the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Cornwall Council</b> (Document Reference 7.4(B)) [REP2-017] or the <b>Local Impact Report</b> [REP1-010] submitted by Cornwall Council at Deadline 1</p> <p>Highways England proposes that the unnamed road C0089 would therefore only provide access to St Freda Nursery and the adjacent field from the north, with the section between the realigned existing</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p>A30 and the access to St Freda Nursery removed and planted with deciduous native woodland planting.</p> <p>On this basis, it is not proposed to redesignate the section of C0089 to be removed as a bridleway.</p>
2e	Any other matters	
3a	<p>CCAF [RR-067] commented on signage at Chiverton Cross and Mitchell for cyclists. This is aimed at cyclists who might be using the existing A30 – I understand that cyclists would be prevented from using the proposed new section of the A30. Is that correct?</p>	<p>Highways England have provided a response to similar points raised by Cornwall Countryside Access Forum (CCAF) in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comments on Relevant Representations</b> (Document Reference 8.1) [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1</li> <li>• <b>Comments on Written Representations</b> (Document Reference 8.6) [REP2-022] submitted at Deadline 2</li> </ul> <p>Cyclists would be prohibited from using the proposed new A30 east of the eastbound off slip at the Chiverton Junction and west of the westbound off slip at the Carland Cross Junction, and would be diverted to the parallel detrunked existing A30.</p> <p>Signage would be provided to notify cyclists on the A30 of the approaching prohibition and direct them off at the new Chiverton and Carland Cross junctions, as well as direct them through the new junctions.</p>
3b	<p>The applicant has indicated that signage would be dealt with via the CEMP. Would this be an 'end of the process' job or something undertaken as relevant sections were completed?</p>	<p>Signage would be designed during the detailed design stage and would need to be installed before that section of the new scheme would be open to traffic. If still subject to temporary traffic management, this would be in the form of temporary signage.</p> <p>Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.10 of the Public Rights of Way Management Plan in the <b>Outline CEMP Annexes</b> (Document Reference 6.4) [APP-376] outlines that: "<i>Highways England and its</i></p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p><i>contractor would provide appropriate signage for re-provided and new PRow in agreement with Cornwall Council".</i></p> <p>This is recorded in reference 19.6 in Table 4.1 'Matters Agreed' of the <b>Statement of Common Ground between Highways England and Cornwall Council</b> (Document Reference 7.4(B)) [REP2-017].</p>
3c	Does the applicant have any comment on the request by Cornwall Council for bilingual signs?	<p>Highways England provided a response to this in the <b>Comments on Local Impact Report</b> (Document Reference 8.5) [REP2-021] submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>This is a matter of policy which Cornwall Council would need to discuss with DfT.</p> <p>Traffic signs must either be prescribed by Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) or specially authorised by the Department for Transport (DfT). Signs that are neither prescribed or authorised are obstructions on the highway and would be removed. Bilingual signs incorporating Cornish legends are not prescribed in TSRGD and the DfT has confirmed that they will not authorise such signs going forward.</p> <p>On this basis, Highways England cannot provide the junction names in the Cornish language as well as English. If Cornwall Council would like Cornish language names added to any signs on the Strategic Road Network, they would need to discuss this matter with DfT directly.</p> <p>This is recorded in reference 13.2 in Section 5.2 'Specific Matters Outstanding' of the in the <b>Statement of Common Ground between Highways England and Cornwall Council</b> (Document Reference 7.4(B)) [REP2-017].</p>
3d	Any other matters	
4a	CCAF [RR-067] commented on the crossing of the A39 south of Carland Cross. The BHS [RR-078] also raised concern in relation to	The proposed uncontrolled WCH crossings have been designed in accordance with the relevant standards including:



Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
	<p>the A39 crossing in relation to vulnerable users, requesting provision of a “Pegasus” Crossing.</p> <p>The applicant indicates that vehicle speeds are low, with very good visibility to and from the crossing. It is proposed to provide an at-grade crossing over four lanes of traffic making use of the junction splitter island. It is noted that Table 7-12 of the Transport Report [APP-049] indicates a decrease in traffic flow on this route with the scheme compared to Do Minimum (DM).</p> <p>What matters have been taken into account in considering the proposed crossing design?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DMRB TA68/96 Assessment and Design of Crossings;</li> <li>• TA91/05 Provisions for Non-Motorised Users;</li> <li>• TA90/05 Geometric design of routes; and</li> <li>• IAN195/16 Cycle traffic on SRN.</li> </ul> <p>The crossings have been agreed with Cornwall Council as part of the highway proposals for all new or amended Cornwall Council side roads and as detailed in matter 2.9 of the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Cornwall Council</b> (Document Reference 7.4(B)) [REP2-017] submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The WCH numbers recorded from surveys was very low, however Highways England accepts that they could increase with the new WCH link provided to Mitchell and the new WCH link and underpass from the roundabout to the realigned existing A30.</p> <p>In accordance with DMRB TA68/96 and the Cornwall Council Traffic Engineering Manual on Pedestrian Crossings, the numerical assessment for indicating where a formalised crossing should be provided (<math>PV^2 &gt; 150 \times 10^6</math>, where P is two-way hourly pedestrian flow and V is two-way hourly traffic flow) confirmed that even with an allowance of latent demand, a formalised crossing was not required</p> <p>In the case of the A39 crossing, the pedestrian, cyclist and horse riding numbers would have to reach approximately 145/hr for this formula to confirm that a formal crossing is required (and this includes an allowance for suppressed demand). With only 7 per day recorded as currently using the crossing and only 17 per day using the adjacent bridleway, the formula could not justify the crossing.</p> <p>The crossing would be located close to the roundabout as part of the Carland Cross junction and would use the existing junction splitter islands to maintain the reduced crossing distances, as per the existing crossing for walkers and cyclists. This is considered to be the ‘desire line’ of the crossing of the roundabout and there is no known accident record at this existing crossing.</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p>Vehicle speeds would be low on both approaches to the crossing, with traffic either manoeuvring through the roundabout junction or slowing on the approach to the junction, which would provide acceptable gaps for the WCHs using the crossing, with vehicles likely to allow the WCHs to cross. The traffic volumes are reduced on the A39 with the new scheme and there is very good visibility to and from the crossings.</p> <p>Equestrian holding areas would be provided on each side of the crossing and within the splitter island in accordance with the requirements of the standards referenced above.</p> <p>Highways England has realised that the proposed Reference UU (PR14) bridleway needs to be extended to include additional holding areas for horses on either side of the existing crossing, and within the existing refuge island. This will be included in an updated submission of the <b>Rights of Way and Access Plans</b> and Schedule 4 of the dDCO at the next deadline (Deadline 3).</p>
4b	In addition to traffic flow data (understood to have been taken from the Traffic Master database) is there any information available on the likely levels of use by NMUs crossing the A39?	<p>As a point of clarification, traffic flow data was sourced from Automatic Traffic Counts (ATC) on A39 with turning counts at Carland Cross.</p> <p>Surveys on the existing levels of use were completed by Highways England as part of the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment required under DMRB to inform the scheme design and to inform <b>Chapter 12 People &amp; Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.4) [APP-065].</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken at the A39 junction between 7am and 7pm on Friday 25, Saturday 26 and Sunday 27 August 2017. On the day of the surveys, this showed limited use with a total of 4 movements eastbound and 3 movements westbound and no equine movements.</p> <p>The findings from these surveys were reported in <b>Chapter 12 People &amp; Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		Reference 6.4) [APP-065] and the Survey Reports have been shared with Truro Cycling Campaign.
4c	Any other matters	
5a	Any matters arising from the comments of the Ramblers' Association [RR-083] that the proposed road would bisect an area designated as Access Land under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, west of Carland Cross (6.3 Environmental Statement Figure 7.2 – Landscape Designations Sheet 1 of 2 {APP-173} & 2.3(A) Special Category Land Plan {AS-013}). No means of access is proposed to the southern part of this land, but it appears relatively easy to provide access on foot along the disused length of the old A30.	<p>Further to ongoing engagement with Historic England, Highways England proposes to provide a viewing area looking over Newlyn Downs in this area. The Environmental Masterplans would need to be updated to reflect this and the provision of access on foot to the southern part of the CRoW land would be clarified as part of that.</p> <p>Highways England is reviewing the opportunity to request a non-material amendment to the DCO application in discussion with landowners. This request may be made at Deadline 5.</p>
5b	Any matters arising from the comments of the Ramblers' Association [RR-083] that in mitigation for the loss of Access Land, the proposed new heathland should be designated as CRoW Access Land	<p>As explained in the <b>Statement of Reasons</b> (Document Reference 4.1) [APP-006], the Applicant has adopted a precautionary approach to the status of this land and is treating it as open space. As such, the Applicant has identified and provided replacement open space land, which is illustrated on the <b>Special Category Land Plan</b> (Document Reference 2.3(A)) [AS-013].</p> <p>Replacement open space land to compensate the land take is to be provided at Warren's Barrow. This would be more than the current open space land and would be accessed from the new WCH link on the line of the old A30.</p> <p>There is no legal requirement or need for that replacement land to also be given CROW status.</p> <p>The new heathland proposed is to the north of the existing A30. This is not currently CRoW land and is part of the Trewithen Estate. It is not appropriate or necessary for this to be designated as CRoW land due to the provision of replacement land elsewhere.</p> <p>The Open Space replacement land is not suitable for heathland as noted in Appendix B: Factual Report of Topsoil Investigation of <b>Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions</b></p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		(Document Reference 8.4) [REP2-020]. This is due to the PH levels and phosphates.
5c	Any other matters	
6a	<p>CCAF [RR-067] and the BHS [RR-078] commented on this crossing, which is currently an at-grade crossing.</p> <p>The applicant indicates that the proposed underpass at Zelah would be for walkers, connecting to the existing route, which involves stepped access. Cyclists and horse riders would be able to use the Trevalso Lane underpass to the east. It is noted that the dDCO refers to KK as a new bridleway.</p> <p>Could the applicant please note that it may be helpful to have a large-scale plan relating to this area clarifying the proposal to assist in discussion.</p>	<p>The new PRow route Reference KK (PR11) has been proposed for all WCH users allowing Cornwall Council to upgrade their existing crossing in the future for all users if desirable and by doing so facilitating as a route across both the existing and new A30 as a route for all users.</p>
6b	CC – please provide information on the highway status of Church Lane and the U6063 to the east. A plan may be helpful to assist in discussion	For Cornwall Council.
6c	What matters have been taken into account in considering the proposed crossing design?	<p>The new WCH underpass has been provided under the new A30 to allow the current pedestrian route on Church Lane to be maintained to the south of the existing A30.</p> <p>It is currently a desire line to and from the adjacent village of Zelah for pedestrians, utilising an at-grade crossing of the existing A30.</p> <p>Existing surveys confirm that cyclists are using Trevalso Lane and joining/crossing the existing A30 at Trevalso, with no evidence of equestrians using either crossing. With the new scheme, cyclists and horse riders would use the new underpass at Trevalso Farm and use the realigned Henvy Lane.</p> <p>There is good full standard visibility to and from the existing pedestrian crossing on the existing A30 and there is no known accident record at the crossing.</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p>Traffic levels will reduce significantly on the existing A30 (20% approximately) with the new scheme and the width of the existing road will be reduced as part of the detrunking works as proposed by Cornwall Council and outlined in the <b>Local Impact Report</b> [REP1-010].</p> <p>In accordance with DMRB TA68/96 and the Cornwall Council Traffic Engineering Manual on Pedestrian Crossings, the numerical assessment for indicating where a formalised crossing should be provided (<math>PV2 &gt; 150 \times 10^6</math>, where P is two-way hourly pedestrian flow and V is two-way hourly traffic flow) confirmed that even with an allowance of latent demand, a formalised crossing was not required.</p> <p>In the case of the A30 crossing, the pedestrian, cyclist and horse riding numbers would have to reach approximately 200/hr for this formula to confirm a formal crossing required (and this includes an allowance for suppressed demand). With only 7 per day recorded as currently using the crossing and only 17 per day using the adjacent bridleway, the formula could not justify the crossing.</p>
6d	<p>Any matters arising from the CC LIR [REP1-010] comment on Rights of Way and Access Plans Sheet 5-ref. JJ(PR10), asking whether the private means of access (16) could be changed to Public Bridleway and linked to JJ along south side of bypass to give a connection to the east from the underbridge.</p> <p>[Note that the directions 'east', 'south', etc, have been taken from the CC LIR and may require clarification]</p>	<p>Highways England provided a response to this in the <b>Comments on Local Impact Report</b> (Document Reference 8.5) [REP2-021] submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The scheme is not impacting an existing Public Right of Way and therefore there is no need to mitigate an impact in this location.</p> <p>Private access (16) was requested by the landowner as a private access, so any public bridleway over this length would have to be separate and run parallel to it.</p> <p>There is insufficient land available within the scheme to provide a parallel bridleway to the private access and its extension through to the existing bridleway JJ.</p>
6e	<p>Any matters arising from the CC LIR [REP1-010] comment on Rights of Way and Access Plans Sheet 5- ref. LL (U6083), asking whether the historical gap in highway rights of the unclassified lane</p>	<p>Highways England provided a response to this in the <b>Comments on Local Impact Report</b> (Document Reference 8.5) [REP2-021] submitted at Deadline 2.</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
	U6083, where it crosses the existing A30, could be dealt with by extending the footpath over the existing A30 to provide continuous link	<p>The new underpass and crossing of the new A30 will tie into the existing southern steps, with the existing steps and crossing of the existing A30 retained.</p> <p>Cornwall Council could extend the footpath over the existing crossing as part of their de-trunking works if considered necessary.</p> <p>This is an existing crossing that is not proposed to be changed as part of the proposed scheme / under the DCO.</p>
6f	Any matters arising from the request of St Allen Parish Council [REP1-027] that the tunnel through Church Lane should be under both the new and the existing A30, in line with each other to create a continuous route.	Highways England considered this matter in response to Agenda Item 6c above, which sets out how the numerical and site assessment of the existing crossing, taking into account the reduced traffic levels on this section of the existing A30, demonstrates that there is not a requirement for a grade-separated crossing of the existing route.
6g	St Allen Parish Council [REP1-027] refer to the Trevalso underpass (NN in the dDCO, Work No. 10) in relation to design and access for farm vehicles. Given the proposal that NMUs would potentially be directed to use this route is the proposed design adequate for all users?	<p>The WCHs would use the new 4m carriageway through the Trevalso Lane underpass as per the existing lane, however, 1.5m verges are proposed on each side of the carriageway through the underpass. Traffic levels and speeds on Trevalso Lane are and would be very low. In instances where WCHs are within the underpass and are confronted with a vehicle, they could move onto the verge and allow the vehicle to pass safely.</p> <p>The proposed underpass at Trevalso Lane has been sized to accommodate the maximum legal articulated vehicles that can use the public road network.</p>
6h	Any other matters	In response to comments from the British Horse Society, it is considered that any improvements to steps at Church Lane would be enhancements out with the scheme and not considered necessary to mitigate any impacts.

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
7a	<p>There have been numerous comments regarding NMU access in this area, relating to the proposed underpass and the possibility of provision of an overbridge in this location.</p> <p>Could the applicant please note that it may be helpful to have a large-scale plan relating to this area clarifying the proposal to assist in discussion.</p>	Rights of Way & Access Plans, Sheet 1 [AS-025].
7b	<p>The CC LIR [REP1-010] indicated that a separate scheme would be progressed by CC, 90% funded by the applicant under the HE Designated funds programme, with the remaining 10% contribution from CC. This was to be formally announced at media launch event on 20 February 2019.</p> <p>Has this occurred?</p>	<p>Highways England formally announced the Designated Funds projects at the media launch event held on 20 February.</p> <p>Highways England's commitment to the Designated Funds and monies for the proposed cycle bridge at Chiverton Cross has been confirmed in a letter to Truro Cycling Campaign (dated 20 March 2019).</p> <p>This letter is provided at Appendix B in the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Truro Cycling Campaign</b> (Document Reference 7.4.6). The SoCG is signed and will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
7c	<p>If the above scheme is being taken forward please provide an update on progress and an indication of the weight which it is believed may, or may not, be placed upon it by the Secretary of State in considering the dDCO.</p>	<p><u>Progress on the scheme</u></p> <p>Cornwall Council propose to deliver wider enhancements to cycling through Designated Funds which are not related to the A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross scheme. This includes a new cycle bridge at Chiverton Cross junction.</p> <p>As noted in the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Truro Cycling Campaign</b> (Document Reference 7.4.6), the provision of this bridge through Designated Funds satisfies Truro Cycling Campaign, subject to a satisfactory guarantee of its delivery.</p> <p>As noted in the SoCG, Truro Cycling Campaign acknowledge the commitment of Highways England to the allocation of Designated Funds for the provision of the Chiverton Cross Cycle Bridge.</p> <p>Truro Cycling Campaign has received written confirmation from Cornwall Council that their match funding (£2 million) is available; this is evidenced in a copy of the letter at Appendix B in the</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p><b>Statement of Common Ground with Truro Cycling Campaign</b> (Document Reference 7.4.6).</p> <p>No consent is in place for this scheme nor is any application currently pending consideration.</p> <p><u>Indication of the weight</u></p> <p>The Highways England Designated Funds programme is for enhancements or legacy projects which Cornwall Council intends to deliver, outside of the draft DCO and its Order limits.</p> <p>This is a separate scheme that is not required in order to mitigate impacts associated with the scheme and it has not been relied upon in the assessment in the Environmental Statement nor any supporting documents in the application.</p> <p>This separate enhancement scheme would not be secured within the draft DCO or any legal agreement associated with this scheme. As such Highways England considers that no weight could be placed upon the enhancement scheme in considering the dDCO.</p> <p>The enhancement scheme would be delivered by a separate body (Cornwall Council). Planning consent for the scheme is yet to be obtained and it is not relied upon to mitigate any impacts associated with the dDCO, therefore it does not alter any of the fundamental aspects of the A30 dDCO proposals.</p> <p>Highways England consider that to link the two schemes would be inappropriate. However, if the ExA was minded to consider the two schemes as linked, any weight afforded would have to be very limited.</p>
7d	TCC [REP1-032] referred to the NPSNN which sets out that “There is a direct role for the national road network to play in helping pedestrians and cyclists. The Government expects applicants to use reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. The Government also expects applicants to identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure	<p>Highways England has taken into account the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) at each stage of scheme design, including at Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>As set out in Highways England’s <b>Comments on Written Representations</b> (Document Reference 8.6) [REP2-022], Highways</p>



Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
	<p>in locations where the national road network severs communities and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking, by correcting historic problems, retrofitting the latest solutions and ensuring that it is easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions'."</p> <p>It is noted that the applicant believes the proposal would be a benefit of the scheme at this junction compared to the existing situation. TCC believe that the existing severance would be made worse.</p> <p>How has the applicant taken account of the NPSNN in relation to this matter?</p>	<p>England has taken account of each of the relevant policies in the NPSNN:</p> <p><i>NPSNN Policy: Sustainable Transport - Paragraph 3.17 seeks reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. The Government also expects applicants to identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure in locations where the national road network severs communities and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking, by correcting historic problems, retrofitting the latest solutions and ensuring that it is easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions.</i></p> <p>Through consultation and design review, the scheme is considered by Highways England to address these requirements. The scheme proposes 7 new or improved north-south crossings to bring benefits in terms of severance and opportunities for walking and cycling. These crossings are grade separated when compared to the current situation which largely consists of at grade crossings. They allow safe crossing of the key junctions and also at other key points along the A30 (e.g. NCN). With the scheme in place, the existing A30 becomes a better environment for use by WCH given reduced traffic flows.</p> <p><i>NPSNN Policy: Road Safety - Paragraph 4.64 seeks for applicants to contribute to improvements in road safety for walkers and cyclists.</i></p> <p>Stage 1 Road Safety Assessment has been carried out. Section 7.4 of the <b>Transport Report</b> (Document Reference 7.5) [APP-049] sets out the mitigation and enhancement measures associated with walkers, cyclists and horse riders, including where improvements in road safety for these users would be achieved. As aforementioned, the scheme would result in safer crossing provision and a more favourable environment for use by WCH on the existing A30.</p> <p><i>NPSNN Policy: Health – Paragraph 4.80 states that new or enhanced national network infrastructure may have indirect health impacts including affecting opportunities for cycling. Paragraph 4.82</i></p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p><i>states the applicant should identify measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse health impacts.</i></p> <p><b>Appendix 12.1 Health Impact Assessment</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-362] concludes there would be overall slight or moderate beneficial permanent impacts during operation of the scheme, partly due to the improved opportunities for cycling as a result of the scheme.</p> <p><i>NPSNN Policy: Expectations of Applicants – Paragraph 5.184 sets expectations of applicants in relation to PRow, National Trails and other rights of access to land. This also refers to appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse effects on such access.</i></p> <p><b>Chapter 12 People and Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] has assessed the potential effects of the scheme in this regard. The Public Rights of Way Management Plan in Annex M of the <b>Outline CEMP Annexes</b> (Document Reference 6.4(A)) sets out proposed mitigation measures to address adverse effects and has been discussed and agreed with Cornwall Council as detailed in Appendix A of the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Cornwall Council</b> (Document Reference 7.4 (A)) [REP1-003].</p> <p><u>Chiverton Junction</u></p> <p>Overall, Highways England consider that the availability of a safe crossing for walkers, cyclists and horse riders at the location of the underpass is a benefit of the scheme compared to the existing situation as it also provides better links into the A3075 and the existing A30.</p> <p>The location and design of the crossing has been discussed and agreed with Cornwall Council, as is set out in reference 2.10, Appendix A of the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Cornwall Council</b> (Document Reference 7.4(A)) [REP1-003].</p> <p>Recent discussions between Highways England and Truro Cycling Campaign has led to agreement in relation to the need for the underpass and its role in serving more than the Truro to St Agnes</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		route. This is evidenced in the signed <b>Statement of Common Ground with Truro Cycling Campaign</b> (Document Reference 7.4.6) submitted at Deadline 3.
7e	<p>TCC [REP1-032] referred to other policies, such as the DfT Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy 2017, which refers to promoting better governance to ensure planning for cycling is incorporated into government programmes and the HE Cycling Strategy 2016, which commits to 'cycle-proofing' the strategic road network, reducing severance and increasing the number of safe crossings.</p> <p>How has the applicant taken account of these wider policies?</p>	<p>Specifically, the DfT Walking and Cycling Investment Strategy is a document that sets out a series of objectives and aims seeking to help the Government realise its ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choices for shorter journeys, or as part of a longer journey. Objectives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase cycling and walking activity</li> <li>• Reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured</li> <li>• Increase % of children that usually walk to school....</li> </ul> <p>Highways England has had regard to this strategy and its broad objectives through the assessment process.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.11.60 of <b>Chapter 12 People and Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] concludes that there is likely to be a long term and slight beneficial effect of the scheme for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.</p> <p>The Highways England Cycling Strategy seeks to consider the needs of cyclists and improve cycling facilities.</p> <p><b>Chapter 12 People and Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] specifically references in Table 12-5 the Highways England Cycling Strategy as relevant legislation and policy.</p> <p>The scheme developed has, through consultation and design, considered cycling (as well as walkers and horse-riders), seeking to improve facilities where appropriate and possible.</p>
7f	TCC [REP1-032] referred to the Cornwall Propensity to Cycle Study, 2016.	Highways England emphasise that that the referenced document is a study and not a strategy or feasibility study. It presents broad evidence around the potential opportunity and makes a number of assumptions about cultural and infrastructure barriers. The study

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
	How has the applicant taken account of this within the scheme design?	<p>chose an e-bike scenario given the hilly nature of the area. The study highlights some routes of highest potential and includes a route in Truro via the A390.</p> <p>Through consultation and design review, Highways England has developed a scheme which it considers adequately addresses the needs of walkers, cyclists and horse riders, providing enhanced and safer crossing facilities when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>Regard has been had to the Cycling Study and the scheme would ultimately (although indirectly) help deliver its broad objectives through improved infrastructure (e.g. north – south crossings)</p> <p>The scheme as submitted includes 7 new or improved grade separated crossings, including crossings at the main junctions. This infrastructure would help facilitate safe cycling, particularly in a north-south direction where users need to safely cross the A30 and especially when compared to current situation.</p>
7g	<p>Sarah Wetherill [REP1-022] referred to HE strategies and policies such as Interim Advice Note 195/16 - Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network. This states at 2.1.2 that 'current levels of demand for cycle trips are not always a good indication of potential future levels of demand. Creation of a comprehensive network of good quality cycle routes has the potential to stimulate demand beyond the incremental change that demand models predict. Designers shall not rely solely on modelled incremental increases relative to current demand for cycle trips, therefore they shall ensure they consider the potential for additional stimulated demand.' It is said that, in following this Advice Note, HE should have factored in a grade-separated crossing in the scheme from the outset.</p> <p>What is the status of this Interim Advice Note?</p>	<p>Interim Advice Note 195/16 gives requirements and advice regarding designing for cycle traffic for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It supplements and amends the cycling specific information provided in other DMRB standards.</p> <p>The proposed uncontrolled WCH crossings have been designed in accordance with the relevant standards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DMRB TA68/96 Assessment and Design of Crossings</li> <li>• TA91/05 Provisions for Non-Motorised Users</li> <li>• TA90/05 Geometric design of routes</li> <li>• IAN195/16 Cycle traffic on SRN,</li> </ul> <p>The crossings have been agreed with Cornwall Council as part of the highway proposals for all new or amended Cornwall Council side roads as detailed in matter 2.9 of the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Cornwall Council</b> (Document Reference 7.4(A)) [REP1-003] submitted at Deadline 1.</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p>These standards and the assessment of the provision of a formalised crossing include an allowance for latent demand.</p> <p>As presented, the scheme currently proposes three grade separated underpasses for walking, cycling and horse riding at Chiverton, Church Land and Newlyn Downs.</p>
7h	If appropriate to do so, how has the applicant taken account of this within the scheme design?	<p>As set out in Highways England's <b>Comments on Written Representations</b> (Document Reference 8.6) [REP2-022], the new walking, cycling and horse riding provisions within the scheme design have been designed in accordance with the relevant DMRB design standards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TA68/96 Assessment and design of Crossings</li> <li>• TA90/05 - The Geometric Design of Pedestrian, Cycle and Equestrian Routes</li> <li>• TA91/05 - Provisions for Non-Motorised Users, Interim Advice Note 195/16 – Cycle Traffic and the SRN</li> <li>• TD36/93 - Subways for Pedestrians and Pedal Cyclists Layout and Dimensions.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed facilities at Chiverton include 2m wide footway/cycleways within sections of the new highway verges, with a 0.5m median and sections of 3m wide off-carriageway restricted byways to allow users to avoid crossing the new carriageways at the new junction roundabout. The one restricted byway (PR2) routes through a new underpass under the new A30 and links between the realigned B3277 and the A390.</p> <p>The proposed underpass has been designed as a straight continuous alignment with width and height dimensions (4m width and 2.7m height) greater than the minimum required standards for an unsegregated walking, cycling and horse riding route, as specified in IAN 195/16 and TD36/93 and guidance from Sustrans and British Horse Society (minimum width 3m and minimum height 2.2m for cyclists and 2.7m for horses (if dismount)).</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		<p>The exit would be visible on entering the underpass and there would be very good visibility to, from and through the underpass.</p> <p>The underpass has short approach gradients from the road network of less than 1:20 and a continuous shallow gradient through the underpass from east to west.</p> <p>The underpass would have angled wingwalls to maximise the natural light at the entrances and would be lit with motion sensitive lighting. This would match the natural lighting outside of the underpass.</p>
7i	<p>Sarah Wetherill [REP1-022] also referred to HD 42/05 Non-motorised user Audits indicating that this requires assessments to consider 'potential routes and desire lines not currently used, e.g. due to personal safety or road safety fears and to take into account desire lines and trip generators. This was updated in 2017 (HD 42/17) to reiterate the need to include 'a review of significant local trip generators and amenities in the area surrounding the highway scheme to identify likely desire lines for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians'. Advice note 91/05 states that 'it is important to consider the range of potential users, key destinations and latent demand in determining the appropriate form of NMU [Non-Motorised User] provision'.</p> <p>What is the status of these documents?</p>	<p>HD 42/05 was updated in 2017 (HD 42/17) and contains requirements for the provision of Walking, Cycling &amp; Horse-Riding Assessment and Review on the motorway and all- purpose trunk road network.</p> <p>TA91/05 gives requirements and advice for the provisions for NMUs.</p> <p>As part of the design process, Highways England has undertaken the necessary Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment Report and Stage 1 Review Report in accordance with the standards and the results of this process have informed scheme design and formed a basis for assessment.</p> <p>For example, surveys and engagement undertaken as part of the WCH Assessment / Review reporting stage have informed <b>Chapter 12 People and Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] and the scheme design.</p>
7j	<p>If appropriate to do so, how has the applicant taken account of them within the scheme design?</p>	<p>Highways England have provided a response to this matter in relation to Agenda Item no. 7i above.</p>
7k	<p>John Wetherill [REP1-016] referred to HE 'TD 36/93 Subways for Pedestrians and Pedal Cyclists', which refers to underpasses raising concerns regarding 'Personal Security Aspects'. He also refers to Advice Note 91/05, which notes that 'personal safety can be a significant issue in underpasses. Reference is made to the Sustrans</p>	<p>As set out in Highways England's <b>Comments on Written Representations</b> (Document Reference 8.6) [REP2-022], TA91/05 and TD36/93 are current DMRB standards giving advice and guidance on NMU provisions and associated subways. The</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
	<p>Design Manual, February 2015, which refers to underbridges as likely to generate 'issues of personal security'. Bernard Quigg [REP1-008] indicates that family members would probably be too nervous to use the tunnel. Similar issues were raised in other RRs.</p> <p>What is the status of these documents?</p>	<p>Sustrans Design Manual is Sustrans current technical guidance for active travel.</p> <p>These standards do note that personal safety has to be considered but also note that underpasses are preferred by horse riders.</p> <p>The crossings proposed by Highways England are seeking to cater for all users. To maximise personal safety and security, the proposed underpass has been designed as a straight continuous alignment with width and height dimensions (4m width and 2.7m height) greater than the minimum required standards for an unsegregated walking, cycling and horse riding route as specified in IAN 195/16 and TD36/93 and guidance from Sustrans and British Horse Society (minimum width 3m and minimum height 2.2m for cyclists and 2.7m for horses (if dismount)).</p> <p>The exit would be visible on entering the underpass and there would be very good visibility to, from and through the underpass. The underpass has short approach gradients from the road network of less than 1:20 and a continuous shallow gradient through the underpass from east to west.</p> <p>The underpass would have angled wingwalls to maximise the natural light at the entrances and would be lit with motion sensitive lighting. This would match the natural lighting outside of the underpass.</p>
7l	<p>If appropriate to do so, how has the applicant taken account of them within the scheme design?</p>	<p>Highways England have provided a response to this matter in relation to Agenda Item no. 7k above.</p>
7m	<p>John Wetherill [REP1-016] referred to the proposed width of 4 metres, indicating it to be less than the 5 metres required to afford segregation of users, as referred to in HD 36/93. The proposed underpass height is not the 3.7m minimum headroom sought where bridleways are to be incorporated into subways (except where suitable facilities for the riders to dismount and remount are provided). HE TA 90/05 'The Geometric Design of Pedestrian Cycle and Equestrian Routes' refers to the need to avoid low headroom</p>	<p>Highways England have provided a response to this matter in relation to Agenda Item no. 7k above.</p> <p>The correct reference is TD36/93, not HD36/93 as stated by Mr Wetherill. Mr Wetherill references the 5m width regarding minimum dimensions for segregated subways for pedestrians and cyclists shown in Table 2 of TD36/93. Highways England consider that the scheme at 4m exceeds the 3m width regarding minimum</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
	<p>over longer distances since horses are more difficult to control when being led. The British Horse Society [RR-078] raised concerns that the long underpass for cyclists, walkers and horse riders would be very low for equines, with a minimum of 3.5 metres required. It was also said that the proposed width was narrow, in view of its length, to accommodate all users including equines.</p> <p>What is the status of these documents?</p>	<p>dimensions for subways for equestrian use provided at paragraph 4.10 of TD36/93 (in addition to guidance from Sustrans and British Horse Society where minimum width is 3m and minimum height is 2.2m for cyclists and 2.7m for horses if dismount).</p>
7n	<p>If appropriate to do so, how has the applicant taken account of them within the scheme design?</p>	<p>Highways England have provided a response to this matter in relation to Agenda Item no. 7k above.</p>
7o	<p>Any other matters</p>	
9	<p>Review of issues and actions arising</p> <p>The ExA will address how any actions placed on the Applicant are to be met and consider the approaches to be taken to the examination of the dDCO and any changes to it, in the light of issues raised in this hearing.</p>	
British Horse Society Comments -	<p>Continuation of Bridleway 309/3</p> <p>ESSENTIAL that a bridleway connection is provided parallel to the new road to connect to the County Road from Higher Tresawento Allet (JJ). This was promised in our initial consultations on the scheme</p>	<p>This alternative was raised and discussed during early engagement informing the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment process, which considered general opportunities in the area. That helped to inform the Environmental Statement, which considered likely impacts and required mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed approach is considered to be the appropriate solution in light that it would involve like for like provision by way of access and more suitable alternative crossing points of the A30 that exist both west and east of bridleway 309/3/1. This has been agreed with Cornwall Council and documented in the Statement of Common Ground with Cornwall Council (Document Reference 7.4(A)) [REP1-003].</p> <p>It is considered that any walkers, cyclists or horse-riders travelling from the south on bridleway 309/5/1 looking to route north to the existing A30 and continue on the Allet Road C0049, would travel</p>



Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item or matter raised during the hearing	Summary of Oral Submissions
		east on the B3284 to join the Allet Road C0049 rather than route west to join the bridleway 309/5/1 to then go back east to the Allet Road C0049. Also, this connection would require land acquisition outside of the Order limits of the dDCO. As such, Highways England is unwilling to provide the suggested additional bridleway connection.
	Continuation of Bridleway 319/9 to Bridleway 319/1 The connection appears on the plans as a PRIVATE ACCESS ROAD (15) This MUST be designated as Public Bridleway as well as providing access to the property.	This is in relation to PR9, where in the Chapter 12 of the ES, it is stated that the eastern section of BR319/9/1 from Hill House to intersection with BR 319/1/1 to be permanently extinguished. BR 319/9/1 would be diverted onto new private means of access to Hill House to allow continued access as existing.





If you need help accessing this or any other Highways England information, please call **0300 123 5000** and we will help you.