

From: [Hayes, Elliot](#)
To: [A303 Sparkford to Ilchester](#)
Cc: [A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling](#)
Subject: A303 Sparkford to Ilchester - deadline one submission
Date: 11 January 2019 13:27:48
Attachments: [EV-004 Draft Itinerary for the Accompanied Site Inspection - Deadline 1.pdf](#)
[R1-001 Comments on Relevant Representations - Deadline 1.pdf](#)

Dear Michele

Please see attached the Applicant's submission for Deadline 1, containing our comments on the Relevant Representations and the Draft Itinerary for the Accompanied Site Inspection.

If you have any queries please don't hesitate to get in touch. I'd be grateful if you could please confirm receipt.

Kind regards

Elliot

Elliot Hayes | Assistant Project Manager | Regional Investment Programme South West

Tel: +44 (300) 470 5611

Highways England | Temple Quay House | 2 The Square, Temple Quay | Bristol | BS1 6HA

Web: <http://www.highways.gov.uk>

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000
|National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF | <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england> | info@highwaysengland.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme TR010036

RR1-001 Comments on Relevant Representations

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
January 2019



Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

**A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme
Development Consent Order 201[x]**

Comments on Relevant Representations

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010036
Application Document Reference	RR1-001
Author:	A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme, Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	January 2019	Deadline 1

CONTENTS

1	Comments on Relevant Representations.....	1
---	---	---

1 Comments on Relevant Representations

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's comments on the Relevant Representations from the interested parties.
- 1.1.2 These can be found in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1: Applicant's comments on the Relevant Representations

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
RR-001	Jonathan Baker	
1.1	I fully support the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester dualling. The dual carriageway will make safer journeys to the West Country from the South East. I agree with the two level junctions proposed. It seems to be designed as an expressway with layby fitted with emergency telephones. My only concern is a lack of a parallel road to the north side from the proposed Camel Hill link road to the Downhead overbridge for emergency purposes.	<p>The proposed dual carriageway has been deliberately aligned to maximise retention of the existing A303 carriageway for this use. Between the A359 (Hazlegrove) and B3151 (Camel Cross) junctions - a distance of 3.5 kilometers - a total of 2.3 kilometers of existing carriageway will be retained for this purpose.</p> <p>Whilst developing this aspect of the scheme, 2 major land constraints were identified which have prevented the remaining 1.2 kilometres of existing carriageway from being retained (or the provision of a new alternative). At the summit of Camel Hill there is a Scheduled Monument immediately to the north of the existing A303 and land owned by the Ministry of Defense (MOD) immediately to the south of the A303. The existing A303 carriageway passes between these 2 sites. It has been determined that a dual carriageway can also be accommodated through this corridor, although there is insufficient width to accommodate an additional single carriageway without acquisition of land from either the Scheduled Monument or the MOD.</p> <p>Regarding the Scheduled Monument, consultation with Historic England concluded that they would not support the scheme if proposals involved the acquisition of any land from this site. Acquiring land to the north of the A303 for a parallel local road at this location was therefore rejected.</p> <p>Regarding the MOD site, Highways England are not able to acquire land from the MOD by compulsion. Any land for the scheme would therefore have to be acquired through agreement. The Applicant decided that reliance on acquiring the land through agreement presented a high risk both in terms of the project's programme and the potential for buried services in this location.</p>
1.2	The tree planting of banks and bunds will help filter noise and improve aesthetics to the local scattered properties. The dual carriageway is long overdue and needs building as soon as possible.	Please refer to Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044) and Figure 2.8 Environmental Masterplan (APP-107) for details of the proposed landscaping.
RR-002	Mark Wilson	
2.1	I support the dualling of this stretch of the A303 which will improve safety and road conditions for drivers and non-motorised users.	Noted.
RR-003	Paul Griffiths	
3.1	Unacceptable road noise. Having read the project plan in detail and had various communications with HE, there does not appear to be a target for road noise (reduction) and the planned road noise is not significantly different from current levels. This is not consistent with the project aim to "optimise opportunities for enhancement" of the environment and avoid unacceptable impact on the surrounding environment. In fact, the design does not try to reduce noise but for applying modern road surface materials and moving the new road a small distance north of the existing route. As an example, and consistent with other major road projects, "planted bunding" could be applied in critical locations using material removed from other road work locations on this project. Evidence exists that this would significantly reduce road noise for the local community.	<p>Paragraph 11.3.25 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) sets out the Key Performance Indicator for Highways England to reduce noise in noise Important Areas (nIAs). Paragraphs 11.10.54 and 11.10.55 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) discuss the impact of the scheme on these nIAs and Table 11.33 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) shows this quantitatively for the design year Do-Minimum (DM) and Do-Something (DS) scenarios respectively. In the case of DM, the calculations show that both nIAs would have increases between 0 and 3 dB (classified as negligible adverse) whereas for DS the calculations show that both nIAs would be subject to noise decreases: moderate (5dB to 10dB) for nIA 3518 and minor (3dB to 5dB) for nIA 3519.</p>
3.2	HE and my local MP are aware that I will be seeking registration as an interested party and are aware of my views.	Paragraph 11.9.1 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) describes the mitigation measures included in the scheme design including use of horizontal alignment, 7 noise bunds, 3 false cuttings and 4 noise barriers, and low-noise running surfaces.
3.3	We must not forget that this road scheme will be built to serve not only the wider community but also the local community for a number of generations. It must enhance all aspects of life. For reflection, the aircraft industry, car industry, major airport developments and the like have these targets. I can see no reason why a 50% reduction in road noise should not be targeted for the local Sparkford community.	Tables 11.28 to 11.30 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) show the calculated changes in noise level for both the DM and DS scenarios (which are used conventionally in lieu of % reduction or increases). The project complies with the aims of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (paragraphs 11.3.6 to 11.3.9 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048)) and the Noise Policy Statement for England (paragraphs 11.3.13 to 11.3.17 of Chapter 11 Noise of the

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
3.4	<p>In closing, please can I say that I and I would say the majority of the local community fully support this project including its timing. I am impressed with the application but I also maintain that a significant "road noise reduction" must be achieved in order to fulfil its obligations.</p> <p>I remain ready to discuss and review at any convenient time.</p>	<p>Environmental Statement (APP-048)).</p> <p>On the particular issue of the Sparkford Community - the noise increase of up to 1.3dB (paragraph 11.10.61 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048)) is due to increased traffic on Sparkford High Street. This is because the scheme will reduce journey times between Sparkford and Ilchester making the route via the High Street more attractive to vehicles travelling from Frome to destinations south-west of Ilchester and vice-versa. It is expected that some traffic that currently uses the A361 and A37 for this route would divert to using the A361, A359 and A303 so increasing the traffic along Sparkford High Street.</p>
RR-004	The Red Lion (Charles and Clare Garrad)	
4.1	My husband and I own the Red Lion Babcary located directly off the A303. We have looked at the submitted planning application for the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling, and we are really concerned....	Noted.
4.2	The village, let alone the Pub has been completely cut off from the south side of the A303 from the East direction in the application, and other than a huge diversion coming off at the Yeovilton turning, and going back on yourselves to go over the bridge, and then fork off to Steart Hill, we will lose the vast majority of trade for our business which makes up approximately £75,000.00.	The Red Lion is currently accessed from the A303 by vehicles turning left or right from the A303 into Steart Hill and then heading north. If travelling east, turning left into Steart Hill is straightforward, but turning right into Steart Hill if travelling west involves crossing the busy traffic on the A303. Conversely, exiting Steart Hill by turning left and travelling east is currently a straightforward manoeuvre, but turning right to travel west requires the road-user to cross the A303.
4.3	This plan will be Hugely detrimental to us and our business as we discussed in a meeting with the project managers at Sparkford Hall at the planning stage, and all the other public meetings. It seems that none of the practical solutions we suggested made any difference ? (Having a slip road connecting to the roundabout just past Howell Hill would have been a perfect solution) have been ignored. Financially this will be devastating to our business, in which we employ 25 people.	A new left-in / left-out junction is proposed on the A303 eastbound carriageway approximately 600 metres from the current Steart Hill junction. This will be a higher quality junction, making the left-turn manoeuvre to and from the A303 eastbound easier than they are now with little distance added to the overall journey.
4.4	Also all the signage, planning applications etc that we have paid out thousands for, and all the time it took to get it through, let alone all the information we have on our web site, customer reviews, review pages etc etc that says to visitors we are just off the A303 ? All that will become null and void.	If travelling west, vehicles will turn off at the new Camel Cross junction and travel back along the old A303 for approximately 900 metres, before crossing the dual carriageway on the proposed overbridge and re-joining Steart Hill using a new local road on the north of the proposed A303. This journey is approximately 3 kilometres longer than the existing right turn manoeuvre but will be easier and safer to perform during periods of heavy traffic. For vehicles wishing to re-join the A303 to travel west, the manoeuvre will be safer and easier to perform, although longer.
4.5	In 15 years of improving, and reinvesting in our rural business, we are now in the position that one of our main income streams will be denied to us with this planning application. Surely central Government has a duty to rural businesses, in particular the village pub, which is central to the local community.	<p>In addition, the new overbridge may help reconnect the communities to the south, with the pub in the north.</p> <p>In terms of signing, the Red Lion currently has a private arrangement with local landholders to advertise in fields adjacent to the A303. These signs will have to be removed to facilitate the construction of the new road.</p> <p>When compared to the other option that Highways England consulted on during the non-statutory consultation, the design submitted as part of the DCO application significantly improves access from the A303 to the Red Lion due to the introduction of intermediate junctions along the route.</p>
RR-005	Stagecoach UK Bus	
5.1	Stagecoach supports the scheme in principle, given the strategic importance and necessity of the dualling, as a key regional and national road link.	Noted.
5.2	The existing and the future road accommodates both some local and a greater number of longer-distance inter-urban coach services. Not only that, but there is a strong likelihood that the A303 as a whole should be seen as needing to cater for more such use, as buses and coaches represent a greatly more efficient use of road space, and the emissions per passenger km are a fraction of personal car use, at average load factors.	
5.3	It is therefore vital that the scheme design in the scope for both local bus and longer distance coach services, and in particular it should seek to take advantage of the potential to facilitate local interchange at strategic points. "Last-mile" modes are already many, including taxis, "stop and drop" with friends and relatives, and cycling.	

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
5.4	As a major user of the SRN, and a key passenger transport operator, there is a broader question of Highways England's standard processes for preparing and designing major highways schemes. We have not been approached to date on this or any other major scheme within RIS1 nor RIS2, with a view to seeking our input as to how existing and potential bus and coach services can be facilitated.	
5.5	We will make observations as far as we are able on how the scheme could be amended to cost-effectively facilitate bus and coach services. It would obviously be preferable if we were to be approached much earlier in the design and consenting process, here and elsewhere.	
RR-006	The British Horse Society	
6.1	<p>The British Horse Society is keen to see that all routes that are being provided so NMUs provide for horse riders as well as walkers and cyclists. If this is not to be the case we would want to understand the reasoning for this, and why it is considered necessary to remove walkers and cyclists away from vehicular traffic but it is considered safe to leave horse riders, the most vulnerable class of NMUs, in the carriageway, and what risk assessment has been carried out to justify such a proposal.</p> <p>The following representations are made on the understanding that they fall within the DCO scheme:</p>	<p>New non-motorised user (NMU) facilities are generally proposed where required to mitigate for the severance of an existing route by the proposed scheme. These severed routes may be legal rights of way (public footpaths or bridleways) or other routes that groups such as the British Horse Society have identified during previous consultation events (such as the network of lanes and local roads either side of the existing A303).</p> <p>The status of proposed NMU facilities reflects the status or use of the severed route, in order to ensure continuity of use by each group of NMU.</p> <p>A total of 8.5 kilometres of new NMU routes are proposed on the scheme. Of these, 6.8 kilometres (80%) will be designated as bridleway status, allowing equestrians to use them. Of the remaining 1.7 kilometres, 1.5 kilometres are footways (reflecting the fact that current routes either side are only footways / footpaths) and 0.2 kilometres are shared use footway / cycleways. These footways / cycleways provide an off-carriageway route around Hazlegrove Roundabout between the A359 Sparkford High Street and Camel Hill Link. Equestrians are excluded from this facility due to the likely limited use and difficulty they may experience crossing the A359 (south) arm of the Hazlegrove Roundabout.</p>
6.2	<p>Eastern end of Slate Lane</p> <p>The exit here from Slate Lane needs some furniture to warn users of the exit, one option would be to provide staggered post and rail fencing with signs on the road verge warning of horse riders and cyclists coming in from the side, or a large silhouette of a ridden horse and cyclist painted on the tarmac.</p>	Measures to warn approaching users / drivers of this access will be considered during development of the design.
6.3	<p>Going eastwards from the eastern end of Slate Lane</p> <p>The provision of a bridleway here would be beneficial. There are horses at Camel Hill and it would give them instant access to Slate Lane and the safe off-road riding routes being dedicated as part of the road improvement scheme.</p> <p>The provision of a bridleway would also be beneficial from the road at the eastern end of Slate Lane, along the construction access route joining onto the local road at Camel Hill.</p>	<p>The application does not include a bridleway directly between Slate Lane and Camel Hill because a demand for this journey was not identified.</p> <p>Should horse-riders wish to make this journey currently it would be approximately 1.5 kilometres long and involve much of its length along the A303 trunk road. Under the scheme proposals the journey can be made by following NMU provisions denoted by the following points in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (APP-007): BW-AJ-AS-AV-AW-AX-AY-AZ-BA-BB-BL-BK-BJ-BI-BH-BG-BF-BE-BY-BD. This would be a distance of approximately 4.4 kilometres.</p>
6.4	<p>The Sparkford roundabout:</p> <p>Improvements are required to the crossing of the road to Queen Camel (A359) with cutting back of the vegetation to improve sight lines, and the cutting of a channel in the central reservation/pavement to help cyclists and buggies and remove what might be a trip step for horses.</p> <p>Also, the provision of a Pegasus crossing is justified by the expected traffic flow. The NMU route in the verge needs to be two-way and 4 meters wide.</p>	<p>Works at this site will include modifications to the splitter island at the roundabout in order to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>However, the application does not include a bridleway crossing of the A359 (south) arm of the Sparkford Roundabout because it was considered that geometric constraints at this location could not be easily overcome and therefore safe crossing facilities for equestrians could not be provided.</p>
6.5	<p>Plowage Lane, southern side of carriageway</p> <p>It is understood that the northern end of Plowage Lane will be stopped up preventing access onto the new carriageways. There is a restricted byway (Y27/27) which joins Plowage Lane just to the south of this junction. Horse riders and cyclists will need to cross the old A303 carriageway to turn eastward to the new Steart Hill bridge. A Pegasus crossing would be required here if the predicted traffic rate supports this.</p>	An informal crossing of the former A303 carriageway is proposed at this location for equestrians. This is an uncontrolled crossing rather than a pegasus (signal controlled) crossing. A pegasus crossing is not thought to be required due to the low traffic volumes that are likely to be using the former A303 carriageway (approximately 800 vehicles per day in each direction in the design year, or 75 vehicles per hour in the peak hour).

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
RR-007	Queen Camel Parish Council	
7.1	The Council believes that the proposed development will be of great benefit to Queen Camel but it submits that there are three elements in the proposals which are detrimental to the local community and would cause unnecessary environmental damage in both the short and the long term:	Noted
7.2	1. The application fails to pay due regard to the environmental problems of very heavy traffic and congestion in the middle of Queen Camel when A303 traffic uses the A359 and West Camel Road to bypass slow moving traffic through the road works during the construction period. The applicant's bland assurances that traffic will be 'managed' through a TMP do not reassure. The Council will respectfully suggest that the DCO application include details of how the applicant will mitigate the adverse impact of self-diverting traffic.	The Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is being developed in consultation with Somerset County Council and will eventually contain measures for the prevention and mitigation of the adverse impacts of self-diverting traffic. A draft of this document is provided as Appendix B5 to the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148). It should be noted that the Development Consent Order (DCO) application also involves the temporary closure of the A303 for brief periods of time and diversion of traffic along the A359 using the diversion route that is currently agreed between Highways England and Somerset County Council. The final TMP will contain details of how the impacts of this closure will be managed.
7.3	2. The unorthodox design and layout of the proposed Hazlegrove junction will have a negative environmental impact on local communities. i. It will destroy far more of the (Listed) Hazlegrove parkland than necessary. ii. it will needlessly increase the length of journeys to and from Hazlegrove School. iii. It will needlessly increase the distance travelled by traffic joining the eastbound carriageway of the A303 from the A359 (south). iv. It will encourage such traffic to take a short cut through the middle of Sparkford village. The Council will respectfully suggest that the applicant be required to consider an alternative design which would be demonstrably more environmentally sustainable and cheaper to construct.	It is unclear which environmental aspects are of concern in this Representation, although it is assumed in this response that the concern is related to additional traffic travelling along the A359 Sparkford High Street. (i) The Applicant has liaised closely with key environmental stakeholders during the development of the scheme design in order to understand the sensitivity of the Hazlegrove Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and the potential impact that the scheme may have on it. During the course of these discussions the design of the junction has evolved so that its footprint within the RPG is minimised and, where this is not possible, restricted to areas of the RPG that appear to be less sensitive. The design has also evolved to ensure that the elevation (that is, the level of the junction relative to the existing ground level) is as low as possible in order to minimise visual intrusion. Land acquisition from the Local Wildlife Site within the RPG is now minimal. Land acquisition from the RPG itself has been reduced over the course of design development from 16.4 hectares to 10.6 hectares. 7.7 hectares of the 10.6 would be required for the main carriageway regardless of whether a junction was required or not, and 2.6 hectares of the remaining 2.9 has been located within a field at the south-western corner of the RPG which has been identified during discussions with environmental stakeholders as being of relatively low value due to it being intensively farmed. The amount of RPG being impacted by the junction in terms of its footprint has therefore been minimised. (ii) Journey lengths to Hazlegrove School from the east will increase by approximately 950 metres. This is a consequence of locating the underbridge to the west of the existing Hazlegrove Roundabout at a location where existing ground levels enable the local road to pass underneath the dual carriageway (therefore limiting the elevation) and behind a retained section of established vegetation which will provide valuable screening from key views within the RPG. Journey lengths to the school from the west will actually be reduced as a result of the scheme by approximately 200 metres. (iii) Journey lengths from the A359 to the A303 eastbound carriageway will increase by approximately 750metres. This is a consequence of locating the underbridge to the west of the existing Hazlegrove Roundabout at a location where existing ground levels enable the local road to pass underneath the dual carriageway (therefore limiting the elevation) and behind a retained section of established vegetation which will provide valuable screening from key views within the RPG. (iv) The Applicant notes that consent is sought for the scheme as submitted.
7.4	3. The application fails to give serious consideration to the advantages of retaining the carriageway of the existing A303 for the use of local traffic, alongside the new dual carriageway between Hazlegrove and Podimore. Such a 'parallel road' would: i. Greatly reduce congestion on local roads during the construction period. ii. Substantially reduce both the cost and the duration of construction. iii. Give the A303 added resilience and improve access for emergency vehicles in the event of road traffic accidents on the dual carriageway. iv. 'Future proof' the local road network when the A303 becomes an Expressway from which slow moving (including agricultural) vehicles are excluded. The Council will respectfully submit that the applicant should be required to reconsider retaining the existing A303 carriageway alongside the new dual carriageway.	The proposed dual carriageway has been deliberately aligned to maximise retention of the existing A303 carriageway for this. Between the A359 (Hazlegrove) and B3151 (Camel Cross) junctions - a distance of 3.5 kilometres - a total of 2.3 kilometres of existing carriageway will be retained for this purpose. Whilst developing this aspect of the scheme, 2 major land constraints were identified which have prevented the remaining 1.2 kilometres of existing carriageway from being retained (or the provision of a new alternative). At the summit of Camel Hill there is a Scheduled Monument immediately to the north of the existing A303 and land owned by the Ministry of Defense (MOD) immediately to the south of the A303. The existing A303 carriageway passes between these 2 sites. It has been determined that a dual carriageway can also be accommodated through this corridor, although there is insufficient width to accommodate an additional single carriageway without acquisition of land from either the Scheduled Monument or the MOD. Regarding the Scheduled Monument, consultation with Historic England concluded that they would not support the scheme if proposals involved the acquisition of any land from this site. Acquiring land to the north of the A303 for a parallel local road at this location was therefore also rejected. Regarding the MOD site, Highways England are not able to acquire land from the MOD by compulsion. Any

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
		land for the scheme would therefore have to be acquired through agreement. The Applicant decided that reliance on acquiring the land through agreement presented a high risk both in terms of the project's programme and the potential for buried services in this location.
RR-008	Hazlegrove Preparatory School	
8.1	1. The traffic pattern for movements to and from Hazlegrove School is extremely uneven with the vast majority of vehicles dropping pupils off over a very short period of time in the morning, and the reverse in the evening. The School has met with consultants on a number of occasions and asked for confirmation that traffic modelling has taken place underpinned by traffic counts taken at peak times. The current layout requires traffic to negotiate a T-Junction and there is a risk that traffic will back up, possibly as far as the roundabout. There has been no reassurance from consultants that the design can deal with peak flows.	Highways England's consultants provided details of traffic modelling along with reassurance that the junction could cope with the anticipated traffic flows on 18 July 2018. A position statement has been drafted with Hazlegrove School and has been issued to the school for comment.
8.2	2. Hazlegrove School currently has its own branded signage on the A303 roundabout seen by every car heading East. This is a major source of visibility for the school. With the entrance drive to Hazlegrove moved off the A303, this marketing tool will be lost. This significant loss has been raised with the consultants, but no mitigation has been offered.	A position statement has been drafted with Hazlegrove School and has been issued to the school for comment.
RR-009	Hawk House Ltd	
9.1	It is felt that a more 'On-Line' approach should be utilised to achieve the project objectives of dualling the A303 between Sparkford and Ilchester.	The proposed solution is considered an on-line solution. It is not possible to simply add additional lanes to the existing road, largely because the geometry of the existing road is not suited to high-speed traffic. There is a junction proposed with the B3151 and as such vehicles will be able to continue to leave the A303 and join the B3151, almost exactly as they do now. For vehicles travelling east, they will exit slightly further east and cross over the proposed overbridge, before joining the old A303 and then B3151. It will also be possible to join the local road network at the new B3151 junction, from which access to and from Hawk House will be possible.
9.2	Delays on the existing road are invariably caused by two lanes merging into one or accidents further east or west of Camel Cross; usually at roundabouts!	
9.3	Widening of the existing road route to create a dual carriageway would undoubtedly be a far more cost effective and less damaging option than the current complex proposals. Widening would create relatively simple opportunities to further straighten the existing road, at and to the east of Camel Cross, without 'diverting' from the existing route. This approach would also have far less environmental impact than the current proposals. Good access to local businesses and, importantly, RNAS Yeovilton would not only be maintained, but improved by such a strategy.	
9.4	The vast majority of traffic leaving or joining the A303 at the junction with the B3151 is undisputedly going to, or coming from, RNAS Yeovilton. Access to RNAS Yeovilton and indeed, our business, would be vastly improved by grade separated reconfiguration of the junction with B3151 to give safe access both east and westbound.	
9.5	It is also felt that having the east and westbound access directly at the junction with the B3151 would remove any need to have major junctions near Orchard Park or West Camel village and further decrease 'Rat running' through ALL local villages.	
RR-010	The Coal Authority	
10.1	I have checked the proposed development area for the A303 dualling between Sparkford and Ilchester against the information held by the Coal Authority and can confirm that the proposed development site is located outside of the defined coalfield.	Noted
10.2	Accordingly, I can confirm that the Coal Authority has no comments or observations to make on this proposal.	Noted
10.3	In the spirit of efficiency of resources and proportionality, it will not be necessary for you to consult the Coal Authority at any future stages of the Project. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.	Noted

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
RR-011	Alan Walton on behalf of Alan and Pamela Walton t / a Long Hazel Park	
11.1	Long Hazel Park consists of a licensed holiday touring park and a holiday lodge park most of which is approved for residential lodges (mobile homes) for which it holds a full permanent residential licence E/90 from SSDC. This development is progressing. The Park, our home and existing tourism business plus the new development suffers from excessive and intrusive traffic noise pollution from the A303. We have put in place at our own expense some measures to comply with traffic noise pollution in part as a condition of planning. The proposed A303 improvement scheme makes no provision to mitigate this noise at present and it is mooted to increase which will negate the benefit of our measures. We have six lodge plots ready for siting and one holiday lodge all nearest to the A303 with all infrastructure in place. These sites are adversely affected by traffic noise which noise is said by Highways England to increase. This will further thwart our business development and cause heavy financial loss for which compensation will be sought if adequate traffic noise mitigation is not addressed. We have an Expert who is in communication with Highways England to obtain more information so as to enable him to put together a Report. We ask that we are allowed to address the Learned Inspector about these issues and with such Report to invite him or her to incorporate sufficient traffic noise reduction measures along our boundary with the A303 so we can develop these plots. We suggest a sound barrier/screening and quiet surfacing along the route within the area of Sparkford and towards Chapel Cross as well if possible. We ask that any elevated road section near to Sparkford are also screened to mitigate traffic noise.	<p>The model used in Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) did not include the existing fence along the Long Hazel boundary which reduces noise levels. For example, the noise levels (without the existing mitigation) at Long Hazel Lodge are DMOY (do-minimum opening year, that is without the scheme) 56.8dB, and DSOY (do-something opening year, that is with the scheme) 59.1dB, a short-term increase of 2.3dB. For the design year DSDY the level would be 60.1dB which is an increase of 3.3dB. However, when the existing fence is introduced into the model the noise levels become DMOY 56.0dB, DSOY 58.1dB and DSDY 59.2dB. That is a short-term increase of 2.1dB and a long-term increase of 3.2dB.</p> <p>The increase in both the short-term and the long-term would be classified by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) as minor (Table 11.8 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048)) and all noise levels are below the Significant Observable Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) given in Table 11.9 of the assessment (Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048)), even when an additional 2.5dB is added to convert the free-field values given above to facade noise levels.</p> <p>Using the criteria set out in paragraph 11.4.36 of Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048), the noise impact is not considered to be significant.</p> <p>The parts of the Long Hazel Park that are most affected by noise (have the highest noise levels) are the hard-standing areas adjacent to the A303. With the current mitigation, the model predicts that the site with the highest noise has levels of DMOY 58.5dB, DSOY 58.6dB, and DSDY 59.6dB. That is a short-term increase of 0.1dB and a long-term increase of 1.1dB. For both the long-term and the short-term these increases are classified as negligible.</p> <p>The site of the proposed residential lodge that would be subject to the greatest noise increase is site 3 towards the south-west corner of Long Hazel Park. For this site the noise levels are DMOY 55.0dB, DSOY 57.6dB, DSDY 58.6dB. That is increases of 2.6dB in the short-term and 3.6dB in the long-term. These increases are both classified as minor and, as they are below SOAEL, are not considered to be potentially significant. Low noise surfacing will be proposed.</p>
11.2	Attached to relevant representation: Long Hazel Traffic Noise Report.	
RR-012	Forestry Commission	
12.1	Our points will be in relation to protecting, improving and expanding woodland within or near the location of the proposed development. I work for the Forestry Commission within the Forest Services Area Team and my comments will relate to our work with woodlands and the forestry sector in the South West.	Noted.
RR-013	Symonds & Sampson [Greg Ridout] on behalf of Mr John Plested	
13.1	Please see my comments below on behalf of John Plested of [redacted].	Noted.
13.2	Horse Ménage - With the proposed improvements to the A303 moving the road north and therefore closer to the farm buildings, my client is anxious that the ménage may be unusable. Until the construction commences unfortunately nobody will be able to ascertain the potential impacts on the school and as such if at this time it is unable to be used for its intended purpose we would expect Highways England to relocate the school to a more suitable location.	The model used to inform Chapter 11 Noise of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) predicts that the noise levels (L10,18hr freefield) on this land are 52.3dB for the do-minimum opening year (DMOY - without the scheme). This rises to 57.8dB for the do-something opening year (DSOY - with the scheme). This is an increase of 5.5dB. The model has also been used to assess the impact of a 150 metre noise barrier, 3 metres high along the apex of the noise bund. In this case the noise for the DSOY case becomes 55.6dB which is an increase of 3.3dB compared with the DMOY case without the barrier.
13.3	Sound Proofing - Due to the proximity of the road being adjacent to the stables and residential dwelling, we would ask if Buffalo fencing can be installed on top of the proposed bunds at a height of 3m.	A noise barrier would therefore reduce the impact of the scheme from an increase of 5.5dB to an increase of 3.3dB. The cost of such a fence would potentially be ~£150,000 to £200,000 and it is noted that a requirement of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (paragraph 11.3.9) is that mitigation measures should be "proportionate and reasonable."
13.4	Fence - The existing fence located to the south bordering the current position of the A303 is constructed from concrete posts with high tensile stock fencing and barbed wire above. We would ask that the same type of fence is installed on the new boundary.	Thank you for your comments. Due to the detailed nature, they will be considered during the next stage of the design, detailed design.
13.5	Water Troughs - There are 2 water troughs which require relocation from the southern boundary to the land being retained.	
13.6	Turning Area - If possible we would like a concrete panel of railway sleeper wall to surround this area and the addition of a bin as the existing area contains a significant amount of rubbish in the hedge and ditch.	

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
13.7	Proposed Track – In order to reduce speed and vehicular movements we would like to see the maintenance and access track constructed from a stone/gravel type surface rather than concrete.	
13.8	If you would like to discuss any of the above, please feel free to contact me.	
RR-014	Queen Camel, Sparkford and West Camel Parish Councils (Joint Submission)	
14.1	The three neighboring parish councils of Queen Camel, Sparkford and West Camel jointly agree that the proposed development will be of great benefit to all three communities but jointly submits that there are three elements in the proposals which are detrimental to both general A303 users and local communities, fail to represent 'value for money' to the UK taxpayer and would cause unnecessary environmental damage in both the short and the long term:	Noted.
14.2	<p>1 Hazelgrove (Sparkford) Junction). The unorthodox design and layout of the proposed Hazelgrove junction (unique we believe in the UK) will have a negative environmental impact on local communities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It will destroy far more of the (Listed) Hazelgrove parkland than necessary. It will needlessly increase the length of journeys to and from Hazelgrove School. It will needlessly increase the distance travelled by traffic joining the eastbound carriageway of the A303 from the A359 (south). It will encourage such traffic to take a short cut through the middle of Sparkford village. It will encourage traffic to avoid this junction and use the east bound junction above West Camel (Downhead Junction). <p>The Joint Councils have engaged 'Fairhurst', consulting and civil engineers to review and agree its alternative design (which is almost identical to that originally shown in the route selection phase), which, we believe, will be cheaper to construct, uses less of the listed Hazelgrove parkland, reduces the journey distance for parents and children to and from Hazelgrove school, reduces (and therefore, makes more practicable) access to the east bound A303 and will reduce 'rat-running' through Sparkford and West Camel villages. 'Fairhurst' have indicated that taking verification of our alternative design beyond the production of a professional standard CAD drawing would cost the Joint Councils well in excess of £10 - £15K and would in any case replicate much of the design work already undertaken by Mott-MacDonald on behalf of HE.</p> <p>Detailed costings and design information has been repeatedly requested during the pre-DCO phase and has either been withheld or supplied at too high a level.</p> <p>The Joint Councils respectfully suggest that the applicant be required to consider our alternative design and produce detailed engineering arguments and costings that prove beyond reasonable doubt that our alternative design would not be demonstrably more environmentally sustainable and cheaper to construct.</p>	<p>It is unclear which environmental aspects are of concern in this Representation, although it is assumed in this response that the concern is related to additional traffic travelling along the A359 Sparkford High Street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant has liaised closely with key environmental stakeholders during the development of the scheme design in order to understand the sensitivity of the Hazelgrove Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and the potential impact that the scheme may have on it. During the course of these discussions the design of the junction has evolved so that its footprint is restricted as much as possible to avoid land-take within the RPG, and where this is not possible to restrict this footprint to areas of the RPG that appear to be less sensitive. The design has also evolved to ensure that the elevation (that is, the level of the junction relative to the existing ground level) is as low as possible in order to minimise visual intrusion. and acquisition from the Local Wildlife Site within the RPG is now minimal. Land acquisition from the RPG itself has been reduced over the course of design development from 16.4 hectares to 10.6 hectares. 7.7 hectares of the 10.6 would be required for the main carriageway regardless of whether a junction was required or not, and 2.6 hectares of the remaining 2.9 hectares has been located within a field at the south-western corner of the RPG which has been identified during discussions with environmental stakeholders as being of relatively low value due to it being intensively farmed. The amount of RPG being impacted by the junction in terms of its footprint has therefore been minimised. Journey lengths to Hazelgrove School from the east will increase by approximately 950 metres. This is a consequence of locating the underbridge to the west of the exiting Hazelgrove Roundabout at a location where existing ground levels enable the local road to pass underneath the dual carriageway (therefore limiting the elevation) and behind a retained section of established vegetation which will provide valuable screening from key views within the RPG. Journey lengths to the school from the west will actually be reduced as a result of the scheme by approximately 200 metres. Journey lengths from the A359 to the A303 eastbound carriageway will increase by approximately 750metres. This is a consequence of locating the underbridge to the west of the exiting Hazelgrove Roundabout at a location where existing ground levels enable the local road to pass underneath the dual carriageway (therefore limiting the elevation) and behind a retained section of established vegetation which will provide valuable screening from key views within the RPG. The Applicant notes that consent is sought for the scheme as submitted.
14.3	<p>2. Retention of the old A303 as a 'local road' – Despite appeals from all three parish councils during the consultation period, the application fails to give serious consideration to the advantages of retaining the carriageway of the existing A303 for the use of local traffic, alongside the new dual carriageway between Hazelgrove and Podimore. This is wholly inconsistent with similar HE schemes in the South West (A30 at Bodmin) where retention of the old road is seen as a priority.</p> <p>Such a 'parallel road' would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Substantially reduce both the cost and the duration of construction. Improve traffic flow on the A303 during construction. Greatly reduce congestion on local roads during the construction period. Give the A303 added resilience and improve access for emergency vehicles in the event of road traffic accidents on the dual carriageway. 'Future proof' the local road network when the A303 becomes an Expressway from which slow moving (including agricultural) vehicles are excluded. The Joint Councils have engaged 'Fairhurst' Consulting and Civil Engineers to verify that previous proposals to dual this section of the A303 that included a local road, remain practicable and respectfully submit that the applicant should be required to reconsider retaining the existing A303 carriageway alongside the new dual 	<p>The proposed dual carriageway has been deliberately aligned to maximise retention of the existing A303 carriageway for this use. Between the A359 (Hazelgrove) and B3151 (Camel Cross) junctions - a distance of 3.5 kilometres - a total of 2.3 kilometres of existing carriageway will be retained for this purpose.</p> <p>Whilst developing this aspect of the scheme, 2 major land constraints were identified which have prevented the remaining 1.2 kilometres of existing carriageway being retained (or the provision of a new alternative). At the summit of Camel Hill there is a Scheduled Monument immediately to the north of the existing A303 and land owned by the Ministry of Defense (MOD) immediately to the south of the A303. The existing A303 carriageway passes between these 2 sites. It has been determined that a dual carriageway can also be accommodated through this corridor, although there is insufficient width to accommodate an additional single carriageway without acquisition of land from either the Scheduled Monument or the MOD.</p> <p>Regarding the Scheduled Monument, consultation with Historic England concluded that they would not support the scheme if proposals involved the acquisition of any land from this site. Acquiring land to the north of the A303 for a parallel local road at this location was therefore rejected.</p> <p>Regarding the MOD site, Highways England are not able to acquire land from the MOD by compulsion. Any land for the scheme would therefore have to be acquired through agreement. The Applicant decided that</p>

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme
Comments on Relevant Representations

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
	carriageway. As in point 1 above, detailed design works by 'Fairhurst' would be prohibitively expensive for three small parish councils to consider and would in essence replicate much of the work already undertaken by Mott-MacDonald.	reliance on acquiring the land through agreement presented a high risk both in terms of the project's programme and the potential for buried services in this location.
14.4	<p>3. Proposed diversion via A359 - The applicant's proposed diversion of A303 traffic through Queen Camel, Marston Magna and Mudford villages into Yeovil to return via the A37 to the A303 at Ilchester are totally and utterly unacceptable to these local communities. The applicant's bland assurances that traffic will be 'managed' through a TMP do not reassure communities that suffer congestion 'rat-running' through unclassified local road each and every summer and whenever the A303 becomes congested, in either direction. Drivers will follow their SatNav devises along unclassified roads in an attempt to find a shorter diversionary route which will endanger the lives of people living in local communities.</p> <p>Pre-provision of a retained 'local road' linking up sections of the retained (de-trunked) A303 would alleviate the need to close the A303 to traffic during construction of the proposed dual carriageway.</p> <p>The Joint Councils respectfully suggest that the DCO application include details of how the applicant will mitigate the adverse impact of self-diverting traffic and further investigation be undertaken in to the provision of AMPR cameras on junctions accessing routes where HGV traffic is banned.</p> <p>We also ask that the applicant be required to mitigate traffic along A359 through High St Sparkford, Queen Camel and on the unclassified roads through West Camel.</p>	The Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is being developed in consultation with Somerset County Council and will eventually contain measures for the prevention and mitigation of the adverse impacts of self-diverting traffic. A draft of this document is provided as Appendix B5 to the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-048).
14.5	Attachment: Email correspondence Letter in response to Relevant Representation.	
RR-015	West Camel Parish Council	
15.1	West Camel Parish Council considers itself to be the most affected by Highways England's proposals to dual this section of the A303. Council remain broadly supportive the proposed development which, if designed and constructed in a more cost effective and people centric manner could be of great benefit to our and neighboring communities. West Camel PC believes that there are three elements in the proposals which are detrimental to both general A303 users and local communities, fail to represent 'value for money' to the UK taxpayer and would cause unnecessary environmental damage in both the short and the long term:	Noted.
15.2	<p>1. Traffic Forecast for West Camel – the proposed scheme shows a great reduction in traffic flows along the B3151 through Yeovilton and the A359 through Queen Camel as a direct result of traffic being able to freely access the dualled section of the A303 at or near Camel Cross. The only two areas of increased traffic volumes are Sparkford village on the A359 and through the village of West Camel on unclassified roads. To encourage traffic to 'rat-run' through the unclassified roads of West Camel Village is totally unacceptable to our community and will ultimately result in serious injury or death!</p> <p>West Camel Parish Council have consistently lobbied HE to this effect and have largely been ignored. A tenuous promise of a HE funded, Somerset County Highways provided Traffic Calming scheme, has no legal or contractual standing and has deliberately been omitted from the applicant's DCO submission.</p>	The traffic impacts of the scheme are set out in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) Report (APP-151). Figure 12.8 of the ComMA Report (APP-151) shows the traffic flows through West Camel village on Parsonage Road (site 22). Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) in 2015 was 1,700 vehicles. With the scheme in the opening year 2023 this traffic would be 1,700 rising to 2000 in 2038. This impact is not considered to be significant.
15.3	<p>West Camel PC ask that the Applicant be required to work sensitively and responsively with them to ensure that 'destination detail' (currently not available) on signs erected around the Camel Cross (West) and Downhead (East) junctions do not exacerbate existing 'rat-running' problems and direct 'through traffic' to the classified (A & B) local road network.</p> <p>The provision of AMPR cameras at these junction 'off ramps' would help to mitigate the abuse by HGVs of the existing 7.5 tonne weight limit in force on the unclassified roads through West Camel village.</p> <p>West Camel PC ask the Inspector to make the mitigation of increased traffic flows through West Camel Village an enforceable condition of any planning permission in order to safeguard the lives, wellbeing and safety of our community.</p>	

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
15.4	<p>2. Retention of the old A303 as a 'local road' – West Camel PC have consistently lobbied for the retention of the old A303 as a 'local road' between Hazelgrove and Podimore and have strenuously pointed out during the consultation period, that in the last two incarnations of a dualling scheme, the then Consulting Engineers (the last of whom were also Mott-MacDonald) designed a scheme with a retained local road!</p> <p>The application fails to give serious consideration to the advantages of retaining the carriageway of the existing A303 for the use of local traffic, alongside the new dual carriageway. This is wholly inconsistent with similar HE schemes in the South West (A30 at Bodmin) where retention of the old road is seen as a priority. Such a 'parallel road' would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Substantially reduce both the cost and the duration of construction. ii. Improve traffic flow on the A303 during construction. iii. Greatly reduce congestion on local roads during the construction period. iv. Give the A303 added resilience and improve access for emergency vehicles in the event of road traffic accidents on the dual carriageway. v. 'Future proof' the local road network when the A303 becomes an Expressway from which slow moving (including agricultural) vehicles are excluded. vi. Help mitigate the 'rat-running' traffic through West Camel <p>West Camel PC respectfully submit that the Planning Inspector require the applicant to reconsider retaining the existing A303 carriageway alongside the new dual carriageway.</p>	<p>The proposed dual carriageway has been deliberately aligned to maximise retention of the existing A303 carriageway for this use. Between the A359 (Hazlegrove) and B3151 (Camel Cross) junctions - a distance of 3.5 kilometres - a total of 2.3 kilometres of existing carriageway will be retained for this purpose.</p> <p>Whilst developing this aspect of the scheme, 2 major land constraints were identified which have prevented the remaining 1.2 kilometres of existing carriageway being retained (or the provision of a new alternative). At the summit of Camel Hill there is a Scheduled Monument immediately to the north of the existing A303 and land owned by the Ministry of Defense (MOD) immediately to the south of the A303. The existing A303 carriageway passes between these 2 sites. It has been determined that a dual carriageway can also be accommodated through this corridor, although there is insufficient width to accommodate an additional single carriageway without acquisition of land from either the Scheduled Monument or the MOD.</p> <p>Regarding the Scheduled Monument, consultation with Historic England concluded that they would not support the scheme if proposals involved the acquisition of any land from this site. Acquiring land to the north of the A303 for a parallel local road at this location was therefore rejected.</p> <p>Regarding the MOD site, Highways England are not able to acquire land from the MOD by compulsion. Any land for the scheme would therefore have to be acquired through agreement. The Applicant decided that reliance on acquiring the land through agreement presented a high risk both in terms of the project's programme and the potential for buried services in this location.</p>
15.5.3 A	<p>Hazlegrove (Sparkford) Junction). The unorthodox design and layout of the proposed Hazlegrove junction (unique we believe in the UK) will have a negative environmental impact on local communities.</p>	<p>Hazlegrove junction has been designed as a 'grade separated junction' in accordance with Highways England's design standard TD22/06 "Layout of Grade Separated Junctions". The overall layout, in terms of how each link connects into adjacent links, does differ from the generic layouts presented within TD22/06, although there is flexibility within the design standard for layouts to be varied according to specific local circumstances. There are many examples on the strategic road network where junction layouts differ from the generic layouts, including along the A303 corridor itself. However, the proposed Hazlegrove junction does comply entirely with the mandatory elements of TD22/06. Slip road design speed, horizontal and vertical geometry, cross sections and merge and diverge dimensions are all compliant with TD22/06. Each slip road has a clearly defined at grade terminus with the local road network where the priorities between different streams of traffic are clear. Highways England's Road Safety Audit process has provided valuable input to this aspect of the junction design.</p>
15.5.3 A(i)	<p>The junction will destroy far more of the (Listed) Hazlegrove parkland than necessary.</p>	<p>The Applicant has liaised closely with key environmental stakeholders during the development of the scheme design in order to understand the sensitivity of the Hazlegrove Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and the potential impact that the scheme may have on it. During the course of these discussions the design of the junction has evolved so that its footprint within the RPG is minimised and, where this is not possible, is restricted to areas of the RPG that appear to be less sensitive. The design has also evolved to ensure that the elevation (that is, the level of the junction relative to the existing ground level) is as low as possible in order to minimise visual intrusion.</p> <p>Land acquisition from the Local Wildlife Site within the RPG is now minimal. Land acquisition from the RPG itself has been reduced over the course of design development from 16.4 hectares to 10.6 hectares. 7.7 hectares of the 10.6 would be required for the main carriageway regardless of whether a junction was required or not, and 2.6 hectares of the remaining 2.9 has been located within a field at the south-western corner of the RPG which has been identified during discussions with environmental stakeholders as being of relatively low value due to it being intensively farmed. The amount of RPG being impacted by the junction in terms of its footprint has therefore been minimised.</p>
15.5.3 A(ii)	<p>The junction will needlessly increase the length of journeys to and from Hazlegrove School.</p>	<p>Journey lengths to Hazlegrove School from the east will increase by approximately 950 metres. This is a consequence of locating the underbridge to the west of the exiting Hazlegrove Roundabout at a location where existing ground levels enable the local road to pass underneath the dual carriageway (therefore limiting the elevation) and behind a retained section of established vegetation which will provide valuable screening from key views within the RPG. Journey lengths to the school from the west will actually be reduced as a result of the scheme by approximately 200 metres.</p>
15.5.3 A(iii)	<p>The junction will needlessly increase the distance travelled by traffic joining the eastbound carriageway of the A303 from the A359 (south).</p>	<p>Journey lengths from the A359 to the A303 eastbound carriageway will increase by approximately 750 metres. This is a consequence of locating the underbridge to the west of the exiting Hazlegrove Roundabout at a location where existing ground levels enable the local road to pass underneath the dual carriageway (therefore limiting the elevation) and behind a retained section of established vegetation which will provide valuable screening from key views within the RPG.</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
15.5.3 A(iv)	The junction will encourage such traffic to take a short cut through the middle of Sparkford village.	Traffic modelling has identified an increase in traffic on Sparkford High Street with the scheme. In summary A303 eastbound traffic will continue to use the revised junction at Hazlegrove for access to the trunk road. However, traffic travelling north on the A359 would use the A359 via Sparkford High Street with the scheme rather than use the short section of A303 between Hazlegrove and Camelot junctions.
15.5.3 A(v)	The junction will encourage traffic to avoid this junction and use the east bound junction above West Camel (Downhead Junction).	There is no evidence to suggest this will be a significant effect. A traffic signing strategy has been developed which will reinforce the Downhead Junction as a local junction only, for West Camel and the B3151. Journeys from the eastbound A303 carriageway to the A359 north and south will be clearly signposted via the Hazlegrove Junction. Compared with the existing network the journey to Hazlegrove junction with the scheme would be quicker along the dual carriageway so this would encourage traffic to proceed to the Hazlegrove junction.
15.3.3 B	West Camel PC believe that the alternative design which is seen practicable by Fairhurst Civil and Consulting Engineers, will be cheaper to construct, uses less of the listed Hazelgrove parkland, reduces the journey distance for parents and children to and from Hazelgrove school, reduces (and therefore, makes more practicable) access to the east bound A303 and will reduce 'rat-running' through Sparkford and West Camel villages.	The Applicant notes that consent is sought for the scheme as submitted.
15.6	West Camel Parish Council respectfully suggest that the applicant be required to consider the alternative design being put forward by the three joint parish councils, which would be demonstrably more environmentally sustainable and cheaper to construct.	The Applicant notes that consent is sought for the scheme as submitted.
RR-016	Paul Dance Ltd on behalf of Andrea Mattia Alfresco Ltd	
16.1	My clients own and operate the Andrea Mattia Alfresco Diner adjoining the petrol filling station on Camel Hill which is located on the Ilchester side of Sparkford. I object on behalf of my clients as their business will be left in a cul de sac as a result of the road dualling and as such will lose all passing trade. My clients therefore reserve the right to seek compensation should the plan be approved.	The Mattia Diner may contact the District Valuer if they wish, to discuss compensation.
RR-017	Sparkford Parish Clerk	
17.1	The proposed construction of the dual carriageway between Sparkford and Podimore will have benefits for the Parish of Sparkford but there are areas of concern with the proposal.	Noted.
17.2	1. Statements made by the applicant state that during construction and after completion traffic through Sparkford high Street will increase. There are already problems with speeding traffic and rat running through the high Street at peak times, including weekends and holiday periods. Highways England have made no attempt to mitigate this by providing a traffic calming scheme for Sparkford High Street.	Traffic modelling has identified an increase in traffic on Sparkford High Street with the scheme. In summary A303 eastbound traffic will continue to use the revised junction at Hazlegrove for access to the trunk road. However, traffic travelling north on the A359 would use the A359 via Sparkford High Street with the scheme rather than use the short section of A303 between Hazlegrove and Camelot junctions.
17.3 A	2. The design of the Hazelgrove Junction is not designed in accordance with the design manual for roads and bridges, there are no examples of this design and layout on the strategic roads network.	Hazlegrove Junction has been designed as a 'grade separated junction' in accordance with Highways England's design standard TD22/06 "Layout of Grade Separated Junctions". The overall layout, in terms of how each link connects into adjacent links, does differ from the generic layouts presented within TD22/06, although there is flexibility within the design standard for layouts to be varied according to specific local circumstances. There are many examples on the strategic road network where junction layouts differ from the generic layouts, including along the A303 corridor itself. However, the proposed Hazlegrove junction does comply entirely with the mandatory elements of TD22/06. Slip road design speed, horizontal and vertical geometry, cross sections and merge and diverge dimensions are all compliant with TD22/06. Each slip road has a clearly defined at grade terminus with the local road network where the priorities between different streams of traffic are clear. Highways England's Road Safety Audit process has provided valuable input to this aspect of the junction design.
17.3 B	The design will increase the distance travelled to access the east bound carriageway of the A303 and the A359 at Sparkford and will encourage traffic to travel through Sparkford high Street instead, increasing the environmental impact on our community.	Traffic modelling has identified an increase in traffic on Sparkford High Street with the scheme. In summary A303 eastbound traffic will continue to use the revised junction at Hazlegrove for access to the trunk road. However, traffic travelling north on the A359 would use the A359 via Sparkford High Street with the scheme rather than use the short section of A303 between Hazlegrove and Camelot junctions.
17.3 C	It is intended to raise the new road up on an embankment across Hazelgrove Park, this will increase noise levels around our village and in the vicinity of Hazelgrove School.	It should be clarified that the proposals do not involve the construction of an intentional embankment across the Registered Park and Garden (RPG). The profile of the dual carriageway gradually rises from its eastern extent at the tie-in with the Sparkford Bypass to the summit of Camel Hill. The rate of rise through the RPG has been minimised, although there are local instances of low ground levels where the proposed road will unavoidably be elevated above ground level. Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (APP-048) describes assessment work undertaken on the potential noise impacts of the scheme. This document concludes that, although a number of properties within Sparkford will experience noise increases as a result of the scheme, these will be minor, and are not considered significant. Changes in noise levels at Hazlegrove School are anticipated to be

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
17.3 D	It will unnecessarily take up more land within Hazelgrove park which is listed parkland	negligible. The Applicant has liaised closely with key environmental stakeholders during the development of the scheme design in order to understand the sensitivity of the Hazelgrove Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and the potential impact that the scheme may have on it. During the course of these discussions the design of the junction has evolved so that its footprint is restricted as much as possible to avoid land-take within the RPG, and where this is not possible to restrict this footprint to areas of the RPG that appear to be less sensitive. The design has also evolved to ensure that the elevation (that is, the level of the junction relative to the existing ground level) is as low as possible in order to minimise visual intrusion.
17.3 E	The junction will increase the distance travelled by pupils attending Hazelgrove School which sits in the parkland.	Journey lengths to Hazelgrove School from the east will increase by approximately 950 metres. This is a consequence of locating the underbridge to the west of the exiting Hazelgrove Roundabout at a location where existing ground levels enable the local road to pass underneath the dual carriageway (therefore limiting the elevation) and behind a retained section of established vegetation which will provide valuable screening from key views within the RPG. Journey lengths to the school from the west will actually be reduced as a result of the scheme by approximately 200 metres.
17.4	3. The applicant also refuses to accept the need to retain the old A303 as a parallel road alongside the new dual carriageway which would give greater resilience to the A303 and improve access for local traffic.	The proposed dual carriageway has been deliberately aligned to maximise retention of the existing A303 carriageway for this use. Between the A359 (Hazelgrove) and B3151 (Camel Cross) junctions - a distance of 3.5 kilometres - a total of 2.3 kilometres of existing carriageway will be retained for this purpose. Whilst developing this aspect of the scheme, 2 major land constraints were identified which have prevented the remaining 1.2 kilometres of existing carriageway from being retained (or the provision of a new alternative). At the summit of Camel Hill there is a Scheduled Monument immediately to the north of the existing A303 and land owned by the Ministry of Defense (MOD) immediately to the south of the A303. The existing A303 carriageway passes between these 2 sites. It has been determined that a dual carriageway can also be accommodated through this corridor, although there is insufficient width to accommodate an additional single carriageway without acquisition of land from either the Scheduled Monument or the MOD. Regarding the Scheduled Monument, consultation with Historic England concluded that they would not support the scheme if proposals involved the acquisition of any land from this site. Acquiring land to the north of the A303 for a parallel local road at this location was therefore rejected. Regarding the MOD site, Highways England are not able to acquire land from the MOD by compulsion. Any land for the scheme would therefore have to be acquired through agreement. The Applicant decided that reliance on acquiring the land through agreement presented a high risk both in terms of the project's programme and the potential for buried services in this location.
17.5	4. The public rights of way will also be affected and protracted by the door design of the Hazelgrove junction with walkers and horse riders forced to walk or ride along access roads to join rights of way within Hazelgrove park.	A dedicated non-motorised user (NMU) route has been provided alongside the local road carriageway at the underbridge. This route will be segregated from motor traffic. It has been provided on the southern verge of the local road deliberately in order to avoid crossings of the eastbound merging slip road and the Hazelgrove School access.
RR-018	Historic England	
18.1	Historic England's interest in this scheme is focused upon designated heritage assets either directly or indirectly impacted by the proposal. We have a particular focus on the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Hazelgrove House, which will be directly impacted, and on the Scheduled Monuments No. 1020936 Romano-British Settlement Immediately South West of Camel Hill Farm and No. 1021260 Medieval settlement remains 100m and 250m north of Downhead Manor Farm. Whilst not directly impacted by the scheme proposal these two monuments lie in proximity to the Red Line Boundary and we are concerned to ensure that their significance is not harmed through impacts upon their settings.	Responses in relation to the designated heritage assets are provided below. All of the designated heritage assets have been assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken as part of the scheme and is summarised within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043).

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
18.2	Hazlegrove RPG - whilst we accept that the scheme will have an unavoidable direct impact upon this asset, we are concerned to ensure that the adverse impact is minimised and that robust mitigation is secured to satisfactorily offset the harm the scheme would cause. We are currently in discussion with the applicant on the exact extent of landscape mitigation proposals: including whether the height of screening bunds could be increased to screen the full height of a HGV when viewed from key viewpoints within the RPG, rather than offering partial screening as set out in the application, which is particularly relevant to ensuring appropriate mitigation of winter views towards the new road; the nature and extent of tree planting as part of landscape mitigation; and the need for the applicant to commit to a Conservation Management Plan for the unaffected parts of the RPG and this to be secured through the DCO.	<p>A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) will be prepared based on the results of the trial trenching surveys during the Examination Period and is a requirement of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (APP-148). Historic England will be consulted on this WSI and updated in accordance with any comments Historic England may have.</p> <p>Essential historic environment mitigation required during operation would be incorporated into the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), covering elements that will benefit the historic environment such as the planting scheme.</p> <p>Additional discussions in relation to the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) are currently ongoing with Historic England, but it is likely that a Memorandum of Understanding will be drawn up between Highways England and Historic England, for the production of the CMP.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently looking in to whether increasing the heights of the bunds is feasible or whether or not this would result in an alteration to the already established red line boundary.</p>
18.3	Camel Hill Romano-British Settlement - the proposed road will use the same highway boundary adjacent to the monument as the present road. Given the more substantial presence of the new road compared to the existing we are concerned to understand the impact this will have upon setting. We have asked the applicant to provide further information on the comparative levels of the existing and proposed road to understand how the scheme would be perceived from the monument. We are concerned to understand the impact of the scheme on any archaeology associated with the monument but located beyond its boundary. We understand that archaeological fieldwork is currently in progress near the monument and wish to see its results considered as part of the Environmental Statement, and appropriate mitigation proposed where necessary.	<p>Cross sections to compare the existing A303 levels with the proposed levels have been produced and shared with Historic England for their review in November 2018.</p> <p>Archaeological trial trenching surveys commenced in September 2018 and were completed in November 2018. The results of these archaeological investigations will be submitted as other environmental information to support the DCO application during the examination period. The results will help to develop mitigation measures to be detailed within the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which will be prepared during the Examination Period and is a requirement of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (APP-148).</p>
18.4	Downhead Medieval Settlement - we are concerned to understand the visual impact of the scheme (if any) upon this monument and how that impacts upon its setting. We understand that a habitat mitigation area is to be located in proximity to the monument and wish to understand how this feature might impact upon the monument and its setting.	<p>The visual impact of the scheme upon the Downhead Medieval Settlement and the potential effects to setting as a result have been considered within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043). Screening has been introduced by way of landscape planting, cuttings and false cuttings, to minimise the impact of new junctions and traffic on the setting of this nearby Scheduled Monument. Proposals within the habitat mitigation area include the installation of 2 hibernacula and fencing to protect the area from grazing, as outlined in paragraph 2.5.179 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (APP-039). Fencing will be sensitive to the setting of the scheduled monument and will be agreed with the landowner before installation. Table 7.2 of Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (DBA) (APP-067) states that, during construction, effects associated with the installation of the environmental mitigation area is likely to result in Slight Adverse effects. Once installed, effects during operation are anticipated to be Neutral.</p>
18.5	General observations - we are presently unable to agree a Statement of Common Ground with the applicant until the completion of their archaeological assessment and evaluation work; the completion of the Environmental Statement and particularly the cultural heritage chapter; and clarity on the extent to which the impact upon the RPG might be minimised and optimal, appropriate mitigation secured.	<p>These elements are noted within the Historic England's Statement of Common Ground as 'under discussion' and will be clarified as part of further consultation with Historic England during the Examination period.</p>
RR-019	Mr Bryan G Norman	
19.1 A	<p>It is our contention that the design now proposed by Highways England for Hazlegrove junction will be shown to be unsound on environmental, functional and cost grounds and an alternative design based on HE original proposal (Page 85) will avoid these problems. In support of these proposals I will submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i A viable alternative design, proof of concept, at 1/2500 scale ii Traffic surveys iii Approximate quantities iv HE Statement v Cost analysis vi Supporting narrative 	<p>The Applicant notes that consent is sought for the scheme as submitted.</p>
19.1 B	<p>In support [of an alternative proposal for a continuous parallel local road] I will be submitting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i A drawing at 1/2550 scale highlighting the missing middle section. ii A drawing at 1/2500 scale showing that three lanes can be accommodated at the pinch-point iii A simple cost analysis . . . iv A supporting narrative . . . 	<p>The Applicant notes that consent is sought for the scheme as submitted.</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
RR-020	NATS LTD	
20.1	<p>I refer to the letter received by the NATS CEO dated 11th September 2018, notifying NATS of the acceptance of the DCO.</p> <p>NATS anticipates no impact from the proposal and accordingly has no comments to make. Please note our contact details below, and the preference to receive future consultations and documentation electronically.</p> <p>NATS LTD Safeguarding Office 4000 Parkway Whiteley Fareham Hampshire PO15 7FL</p> <p>T 01489 444 687 E natssafeguarding@nats.co.uk</p>	Noted.
RR-021	Christopher David Cree	
21.1	I work at Camel Hill Farm and have specific interest on the changes to be made to the area under the current proposal. Having recently planted a mix of softwood and hardwood whips to start some form of screening, I would like to know if this was misjudged. In addition, I have concerns over the size and complexity of the new Hazelwood intersection as well as the proposed service road running through Camel Hill Farm and resultant viability of the farm during construction of the new road.	The mitigation and access road have been designed following a significant amount of dialogue with the Camel Hill Farm owners. A position statement is being drafted and agreed between Highways England and Camel Hill Farm.
RR-022	Cliff Baker	
22.1	I strongly oppose the plans to the A303 dualling.	Noted.
22.2	Safety of the villagers.....everyday I have to walk along Howell Hill with my wife and dog and everyday there seems to be cars, tractors and vans speeding through and getting very close to us as pedestrians. The reports say that our local council won't do anything as our accident rate isn't high enough.....this surely is the wrong way round.....unless something major happens we are left to fend for ourselves, so rather than being proactive yet again we find ourselves in a reactive environment and this is basic safety of people.	Noted.
22.3	Increased 'rat run' through the village. Traffic whizzing through our village is awful.....from about 8am to 9.30am and then again from 4pm to 6.30pm ON NORMAL DAYS - these times change, on Fridays especially, during summer months. Mott McDonald was seen in our village just the other day (Oct 2018) and when asked what they were doing they were 'viewing traffic' we pointed out that 3pm at the very top of Howell Hill where it meets the A303 is the wrong position to stand when doing such an exercise. If they walked a mile in our shoes and truly understood the traffic and when and where it is at its worst things may be different.....I'm being positive here but doubt it will change anything!	The traffic impacts of the scheme are set out in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) Report (APP-151). Figure 12.8 of the ComMA Report (APP-151) shows the traffic flows through West Camel village on Parsonage Road (site 22). Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) in 2015 was 1700 vehicles. With the scheme in the opening year 2023 this traffic would be 1700 rising to 2000 in 2038. This impact is not considered to be significant.
22.4	Huge waste of money in the current climate.	Noted.
22.5	Seems that it will only improve journey times to around 3-4 mins at certain times during the year.	Noted.
22.6	The parameters of the scheme are laughable as this focuses on a stretch of a couple of miles to increase speed and flow of traffic only for everything to come to a halt at the traffic lights at Podimore as that part of the road network isn't coming under this project!	Noted.
22.7	At every village meeting we have attended it is noticeable that our MP has been very quiet and has only met with our parish council at a 'closed' meeting so as not to hear the views of the villagers. An appalling approach. I actually received an email from him and he stated they are going to propose a traffic calming scheme and to potentially make the village a 20mph limit zone - THERE HAVE BEEN NO TRAFFIC CALMING PROPOSALS SO WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THESE LOOK LIKE OR WHERE THEY WILL BE AND ALSO THE CURRENT 30MPH LIMIT DOES NOT GET ADHERED TO SO HOW A 20MPH LIMIT IS GOING TO IMPROVE THINGS IS REALLY PIE IN THE SKY THINKING.....UNLESS IT IS PROPERLY POLICED IT IS POINTLESS. FINAL POINT ON SPPED LIMITS, LOTS OF THE SIGNAGE AROUND THE VILLAGE IS IN ODD PLACES AND IS OFTEN COVERED IN HEDGEROWS!	Noted.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
22.8	We as villagers and our Parish Council have only been listened to as part of a box ticking process through Highways England and nothing has been changed based on all our thoughts and concerns.	Noted.
22.9	There seems to have been no local weighting in what the improvements and where they are during the decision process.....people far and wide have voted in fact some international comments and they don't have to suffer the outcomes - let alone the upheaval during proposed works.	The consultation process is not a vote but an impartial process open to all, which is undertaken to gather feedback on our proposals. All feedback received during the consultation stages is reviewed and considered at the relevant stages of the scheme development. There is no weighting given to the feedback received during the consultation; all views are considered equally. Although local concerns are significant, it is also important we consider feedback from those using the road for strategic travel from the South East to the South West. Part of the development process of the scheme is to ensure a balance of local needs and strategic objectives are met, which is why the consultation is open to all.
22.10	Nothing has explained why they suggest this is good for business in our local area?	Chapter 12 People and Communities of the Environmental Statement (APP-049) includes an assessment of local economy. The study area for the local economy is the District of South Somerset. Slight Beneficial effects are anticipated during construction, due to the addition of new construction jobs locally and workforce using local facilities. Once operational, there are likely to be increased indirect employment opportunities related to reduced congestion and improved journey times, with a Slight Beneficial effect anticipated.
22.11	It seems the whole project has been decided even before proposals were presented to us locals....it also seems that things have to be decided very quickly as otherwise the pot of money made available may not then be there. This is against what is best for the local area and the country's economy.	Noted.
RR-023	Phil Gamble	
23.1	I will be arguing that:	Noted.
23.2	1. the proposals do not address major issues of safety on the route or resilience.	
23.3	2. if/when upgraded to Expressway the proposal leaves local communities isolated.	
23.4	3. the retention of a local link road between Sparkford and Podimore roundabouts would allow local businesses to continue trading	
23.5	4. the proposed construction programme will cause unnecessary disruption over a significant period to local communities.	
RR-024	Allan Keith Tingey	
24.1	Firstly I make it clear that the dualling of this section of the A303 is long overdue but there are issues that I believe worthy of implementation.	Noted.
24.2	SOUTHERN LINK ROAD. Right from the outset I have advocated that there should be a continuous link of the existing A303 from the fuel station on Camel Hill through to join Howell Hill. During construction this will maintain two way traffic, after construction it will become a local road but also, significantly, it will have the advantage of providing a parallel route for traffic diverted from the dualled road when it has been closed for whatever reason. Great play has been made by Highways England on the A30, which is due to be constructed at the same time as this project, that the existing A30 (with modifications as necessary) will be retained as a parallel local road. Whilst this road represents extra cost for its construction, there are several areas of savings to be made. No Bailey bridge, no haul roads, no separate field access tracks, no compensation to existing trading outlets, substantially all of the construction work will take place on the north side of the existing trafficked A303, etc..	<p>The proposed dual carriageway has been deliberately aligned to maximise retention of the existing A303 carriageway for this use. Between the A359 (Hazlegrove) and B3151 (Camel Cross) junctions - a distance of 3.5 kilometres - a total of 2.5 kilometres of existing carriageway will be retained for this purpose.</p> <p>Whilst developing this aspect of the scheme, 2 major land constraints were identified which have prevented the remaining 1.2 kilometres of existing carriageway from being retained (or the provision of a new alternative). At the summit of Camel Hill there is a Scheduled Monument immediately to the north of the existing A303 and land owned by the Ministry of Defense (MOD) immediately to the south of the A303. The existing A303 carriageway passes between these 2 sites. It has been determined that a dual carriageway can also be accommodated through this corridor, although there is insufficient width to accommodate an additional single carriageway without acquisition of land from either the Scheduled Monument or the MOD.</p> <p>Regarding the Scheduled Monument, consultation with Historic England concluded that they would not support the scheme if proposals involved the acquisition of any land from this site. Acquiring land to the north of the A303 for a parallel local road at this location was therefore rejected.</p> <p>Regarding the MOD site, Highways England are not able to acquire land from the MOD by compulsion. Any land for the scheme would therefore have to be acquired through agreement. The Applicant decided that reliance on acquiring the land through agreement presented a high risk both in terms of the project's programme and the potential for buried services in this location.</p>

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme
Comments on Relevant Representations

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
24.3	JUNCTIONS AT DOWNHEAD AND CAMEL CROSS These are not required for local traffic. Highways England declare that the A303 will be upgraded to an Expressway. Why, on a new construction only 5.5 Kilometres long would unwanted junctions be included when in the future they will be eliminated. The removal of these junctions can be overcome by my next suggestion.	The junction provides access to local settlements including West Camel and provides a connection with the B3151 serving Royal Naval Air Station (RNAS) Yeovilton.
24.4	PODIMORE LINK I recognise that the title for this project is A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling but note that the dualling is purely connecting to existing dualled road at Sparkford and Podimore. (Why not Sparkford to Podimore?) There will inevitably be a link formed between Podimore roundabout and the B3151 adjacent to RNAS Yeovilton serving the base and the Fleet Air Arm Museum. This should be constructed now to additionally be a viable route from the A303, along the B3151 and joining the existing retained A303 and the Southern Link, described above, for traffic diverted from the dualled carriageway. (In 1994 at a similar Inspector appraisal, a proposal similar to the above, outside the remit of the scheme, was put forward and proved to be one of a limited number of issues promoted by the Inspector).	Noted.
24.5	HAZLEGROVE INTERCHANGE The proposed layout can be simplified to the benefit of all users by making the on/off slip roads more compact to the existing roundabout, saving on land take. It is not acceptable to have the NMU's using the same underpass as vehicles, including heavy goods vehicles.	The proposed layout has been simplified throughout the design development process. It reflects the range of users that are likely to use it and also its potential impact on the setting of the Registered Park and Garden (RPG). Land-take, particularly from the most sensitive part of the RPG has been minimised. The footprint of the scheme within the RPG is approximately 10.6 hectares, of which 7.7 hectares are required to accommodate the main carriageway regardless of the junction. The junction therefore occupies approximately 2.9 hectares of the RPG to the north of the main carriageway, and the vast majority of this (2.6 hectares) has been confined to a field at the south western corner of the RPG that has been identified as less sensitive than other parts of the site during discussions with key environmental stakeholders. A dedicated NMU route has been provided alongside the local road carriageway at the underbridge. This route will be segregated from motor traffic. It has been provided on the southern verge of the local road deliberately in order to avoid crossings of the eastbound merging slip road and the Hazlegrove School access.
24.6	CONTRACTOR COMPOUNDS The DCO submission asserts that the A303 will be maintained operational for the construction of the dualled carriageways save for minor closures overnight, essentially. As the vast majority of the new construction is to take place on the north side of the A303 why are the principal compounds sited on the south side? Personnel, plant, material movements will have to traverse the still open two lane traffic on the existing A303, this does not appear sensible.	A number of buildability assessments have taken place during the design stages. Experienced contractors have viewed the design in detail, including earthwork strategy and the location of structures and other assets and based on this information they have determined the best locations for the main compound and the satellite compounds. A temporary bridge is likely to be used to allow construction traffic to travel from one side of the A303 to the other.
24.7	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT The western end of the site is relatively straight forward to maintain traffic on the existing A303 whilst the new eastbound carriageway is constructed and then traffic will transfer to that. The eastern end near Camel Hill Farm is very problematic due to width and levels. It is not clear how, even with suggested temporary link roads that the maintenance of two way traffic flow can be maintained. The prescribed diversion routes are both lengthy and will inevitably cause traffic to seek out alternatives to the detriment of towns and villages over a wide area. The use of the Southern Link Road described above will circumvent these problems.	A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is being developed in consultation with Somerset County Council and will eventually contain measures for the implementation of temporary traffic diversions. A draft of this document is provided as Appendix B5 to the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-048). Design development with respect to the potential for a continuous parallel local road is described in the responses to Relevant Representation No.24.2 (above)
RR-025	Public Health England	
25.1	Thank you for your consultation regarding the above development. Public Health England (PHE) welcomes the opportunity to comment on your proposals at this stage of the project. We have considered the documentation accompanying the application for development consent and can confirm the following: -	Noted.
25.2	We have previously commented on this application at the scoping stage of the project but can find no record that we were consulted during the public consultation stage.	Noted.
25.3	However, having reviewed the submitted Environmental Impact Assessment, we do not wish to register an interest in the application on this occasion.	Noted.
25.4	Should the Applicant or Planning Inspector require any further clarification or advice on any matters relating to public health, we will of course be pleased to assist.	Noted.
25.5	Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.	Noted.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
RR-026	South Somerset Bridleways Association [Sarah Bucks]	
26.1 A	NMU routes should be available to all vulnerable road users, walkers, cyclists and equestrians. Thus, the definitive status of new public rights of way should be restricted byway.	The dedication of proposed rights of way as Restricted Byways was considered during preparation of the Development Consent Order application. However, it was felt that the status of Restricted Byway might encourage inappropriate use by motorised vehicles, and so the status of Bridleway has been used instead.
26.1 B	New routes should be 'future proof', built to accommodate the routes in the DMMO application process.	<p>At the time of the submission of the draft DCO, the Applicant was aware of one such application for a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) that was relevant to this scheme. This was Modification No 859. This proposes to upgrade footpath WN23/12 to bridleway status.</p> <p>WN23/12 is severed by the proposed scheme. Draft DCO Schedule 4 Part 3 proposes to replace WN23/12 with a new right of way along the route BJ-BI-BH-BG-BF-BM-BN-BO-BP. A schedule of limitations has been produced (document ref HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-SH-UU-0001, issued to Somerset County Council and South Somerset Bridleways Association on 31 August 2018). This clarifies that, although some of this route will be legally dedicated as a footpath to be consistent with the current right of way, the physical provision will be consistent with the potential future use as a bridleway. The Schedule of Limitations clarifies that 1.8 metre-wide bridleway gaps in accordance with Section 6.1 of BS5709 will be provided at each point along the diversion route. One bridle gate (at point BO) is required due to the potential for grazing cattle in the adjacent plot. The same document clarifies that the width of this route is generally 4.0 metres wide which is suitable for future bridleway use. There is one exception to this width between points BM and BN where the proposed width is 2.5 metres. This is in the verge of the Hazlegrove School Access.</p>
26.1 C	Where possible, NMU routes are best positioned at a different level, preferably higher, than the level of the new carriageway. This reduces the noise and visibility of the vehicular traffic from the new public rights of way.	<p>Wherever possible proposed non motorised user (NMU) routes have been designed to be separate from verges, and therefore as far as possible from motor traffic.</p> <p>Where NMU routes are located in the verge adjacent to a carriageway, the level difference is minimal. The NMU route and carriageway will be separated by a kerb which will have an upstand of approximately 100 millimetres. This will be negligible in the context of this Representation.</p> <p>Highways England's consulting engineers (Mott MacDonald Sweco Joint Venture) held discussions with the South Somerset Bridleways Association in August and September 2018 and the arrangement of the NMU route through the Hazlegrove Underbridge was discussed. It is likely that a more significant level difference (NMU route higher than the carriageway) would be possible and beneficial at this location due to the enclosed nature of the underbridge. This will be considered and developed further as the design develops.</p>
26.1 D	Diversions where crossings have been closed should be of a reasonable length; a 5 kilometre diversion makes a 10 kilometre round trip, too long to be considered reasonable.	Chapter 12 People and Communities of the Environmental Statement (APP-049) included an assessment of effects to non-motorised users (NMUs). The chapter states that although temporary closures and diversions could result in journey length increases, and construction works could result in a slight deterioration in journey experience, given consideration for the low number of NMUs counted in the 2016 NMU surveys (refer to Appendix 12.1, APP-093) a Slight Adverse effect is predicted during construction for NMUs, with mitigation in place. This is not considered to be significant. Once operational, the scheme is predicted to result in a Slight Beneficial effect on NMUs. The greatest change to journey length is 2.1 kilometres, as described in Table 12.23 of the chapter (APP-049). Although the proposed diversion route would increase journey lengths and times, the new route would be safer.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
26.1 E	If traffic levels demand it, install Pegasus crossings at two sites.	Highways England guidance (Document Ref TA91/05 "Provision for Non-Motorised Users, specifically Table 6/1) indicates that controlled crossings (for example Pegasus crossings) should be considered on single carriageways where the road being crossed is expected to carry more than 8,000 vehicles per day. At this level of traffic, the gaps between successive vehicles become too small to be able to cross without the facility to give the non-motorised user priority over motor traffic. There are 5 locations where bridleway crossings are proposed on the scheme. Each location is a single carriageway. These are listed below along with the predicted opening year (2023) traffic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Former A303 (Camel Cross to Steart Hill): 640 vehicles per day - Downhead Junction Link: This road has not been included in the traffic model as it is a cul-de-sac and as such is expected to be very lightly trafficked. - Steart Hill Link: This road has not been included in the traffic model as it was observed in 2015 to be very lightly trafficked. - Downhead Junction Link: 910 vehicles per day - Camel Hill Link: 1400 vehicles per day <p>On the basis that predicted / anticipated traffic flows on these roads are all significantly lower than the threshold of 8,000 vehicles, it has been concluded that there is no justification for controlled crossings at these locations.</p>
26.1 F	Dedicate NMU routes as restricted byways as these offer best value for public funds. Tracks used as construction tracks make excellent NMU routes.	See response to 26.1A. The proposed construction tracks will be in place temporarily. The application does not include any provision to dedicate these tracks as permanent rights of way.
26.1 G	Land remaining after construction, which is not required for agricultural use, could make valuable parking for recreational users. The new network of NMU routes will attract cyclists and horse-riders who may need to park near these routes.	The potential need for parking associated with recreational use of rights of way has not been assessed and has therefore not been included in the scheme proposals.
26.2.1	North of eastbound carriageway: Southern end of Eastmead Lane: The provision for NMU route detours eastwards to the Steart Hill bridge and back along surface roads into Podimore. This is over 5 kilometres, a round trip of over 10 kilometres, and is considered too long. Although outside the area covered by the DCO scheme, could provision via bridleway (Y30/29) across the vehicular bridge into Podimore be considered.	Eastmead Lane (Right of Way reference Y30/28) is scheduled in draft DCO Schedule 4 Part 1 as being stopped up at its junction with the eastbound carriageway of the A303 at the far eastern end of the dual carriageway Podimore Bypass. There are currently 2 journeys available to NMUs that involve the use of this section of Y30/28. These are (a) travel along the eastbound A303 from the Podimore roundabout and then turn northbound along Eastmead Lane, and (b) travel southbound along Eastmead Lane and then join the A303 eastbound towards Downhead Lane. (NB it is considered that interchange between Eastmead Lane and the existing A303 westbound carriageway is not possible due to central hatching road markings on the A303 carriageway at this location). Taking each of these 2 journeys in turn the alternative route available under the scheme would be (a) continue along the A303 eastbound carriageway until Downhead Junction, leave the A303 at this junction and then join Downhead Lane, and then join Track 2 to head westwards until Eastmead Lane is reached, and (b) from Eastmead Lane turn east along Track 2 and join Downhead Lane at the end of Track 2. The proposed journey associated with (a) is likely to be approximately 4.2 kilometres longer than the current journey, and the proposed journey associated with (b) is unlikely to be significantly different. It is also noteworthy that the scheme proposals avoid travel along the A303 entirely.
26.2.2	North of eastbound carriageway: Eastwards from Slate Lane. HE own, to be used as a construction route, a track from (ST 5777 2559) eastwards to Camel Hill. The proposed route for horseriders from the Camel Hill stables to Slate Lane is 3.5 kilometres on vehicular roads. The construction track is 1 kilometre off-road route. Please could bridleway or restricted byway rights be dedicated on this track.	The application does not include a bridleway directly between Slate Lane and Camel Hill because a demand for this journey was not identified. Should horse-riders wish to make this journey currently it would be approximately 1.5 kilometres long and involve much of its length along the A303 trunk road. Under the scheme proposals the journey can be made by following NMU provisions denoted by the following points in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (APP-007): BW-AJ-AS-AV-AW-AX-AY-AZ-BA-BB-BL-BK-BJ-BI-BH-BG-BE-BF-BY-BD. This would be a distance of approximately 4.4 kilometres.
26.2.3	South of the westbound carriageway The underpass for the local road northwest of the Hazlegrove roundabout should be designed with separation of NMU from the carriageway.	Highways England's consulting engineers (Mott MacDonald Sweco Joint Venture) held discussions with the South Somerset Bridleways Association in August and September 2018 and the arrangement of the NMU route through this underbridge was discussed. It is likely that a level difference (for example NMU route higher than the carriageway) would be possible and beneficial at this location due to the enclosed nature of the underbridge. This will be considered and developed further as the design develops

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
26.2.4	South of the westbound carriageway Hazlegrove roundabout. Please could the track on the verge be upgraded to include equestrians with a fence to separate verge from carriageway.	The footway/cycleway at this location has been included in the scheme to provide connectivity between the existing footway along the A359 High Street (just east of Sparkford Services) and the proposed NMU facilities along the 'Former A303 (West of Hazlegrove Roundabout)' and 'Camel Hill Link'. It was considered that this short 150m link would enhance the benefit of the facilities to residents of Sparkford and also users of the nearby Sustrans Route 26. Existing geometry at the proposed crossing point of the A359 (south) arm of the roundabout was considered too restrictive for the provision of an equestrian crossing, and as such it was not considered appropriate to provide equestrian facilities on the associated track on the roundabout verge either side of this crossing.
26.2.5	South of the westbound carriageway The crossing where the A359 joins the roundabout may benefit from a Pegasus crossing.	As indicated in the response to 26.2.5 above, geometry at the proposed crossing point was considered too restrictive for the provision of an equestrian crossing.
26.2.6	South of the westbound carriageway The local road from AO to AP (sheet 2 of 4) is straight and carries fast traffic, please could bridleway / restricted byway rights be dedicated along one of the verges.	Section AO to AP is an existing section of footpath along a section of the A303 which will be de-trunked. Other than de-trunking works to the existing carriageway the scheme is unlikely to impact upon existing equestrian routes at this location, and as such no mitigation has been proposed.
26.2.7	South of the westbound carriageway Northern end of Plowage Lane (AT sheet 2 of 4). Suggest installing a Pegasus crossing for both users of the restricted byway to the south, and horseriders and cyclists using the old A303 to reach the Steart Hill bridge.	Highways England guidance (Document Ref TA91/05 "Provision for Non-Motorised Users, specifically Table 6/1) indicates that controlled crossings (for example Pegasus crossings) should be considered on single carriageways where the road being crossed is expected to carry more than 8,000 vehicles per day. At these traffic flows the gaps between successive vehicles become too small to be able to cross without the facility to give the non-motorised user priority over motor traffic. The location addressed by this Representation is on the link named "Former A3030 (Camel Cross to Steart Hill). Predicted opening year (2023) traffic for this link is 640 vehicles per day which is significantly lower than the threshold of 8,000 vehicles. It has therefore been concluded that there is no justification for a controlled crossing at this location.
26.2.8	South of the westbound carriageway Camel Cross Link. Access track (tracks 4 and 9); After completion of the works, could NMU rights be dedicated, and extended to join the public road at ST 5526 2498, providing a safe off-road route into Podimore.	The scheme will have no impact on existing rights of way through this section and so no new routes have been proposed.
RR-027	Mr James March Smith on behalf of Sparkford Hall	
27.1	Sparkford Hall, owned by Mr James March Smith and Gillian Beddows, comprises 18 acres of land with gardens, a large detached country house, cottage and range of outbuildings that in recent years have been converted to offices and additional residential accommodation used for the running of a successful wedding venue and events business. The proposed scheme has implications to the running of the business, potential financial losses and a drop in property value. In brief, concerns are summarised as follows:	Noted.
27.2	• Co-operation and communication from Highways England has been very poor since the start of the proposed scheme and there is a significant lack of understanding or agreement to any mitigation works to help reduce losses to the business and running of the business pre, during and post the proposed works.	Noted.
27.3	• Due to this lack of cooperation and advice we have had to seek advice from Counsel and have instructed our Barrister Mr Barry Denyer-Green, Falcon Chambers, Falcon Court, London.	Noted.
27.4	• Numerous requests were made, however information regarding timings of works, diversions, access to the property during construction, temporary lighting, and noise and pollution has not been provided. This uncertainty is currently causing significant impact to potential future bookings of the business. Highways England and their representatives do not understand what implications the lack of information and assistance is causing to the business currently.	A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is currently being revised and this will outline how traffic, both construction and public, will be managed during the works. Every effort will be made to keep the traffic running on the A303 during the works and any closures will be minimised. As the construction strategy is further developed, the Applicant will continue to share appropriate information regarding the timing of works, diversions, access, and temporary lighting with Sparkford Hall as it becomes available. In terms of noise caused by the works, this has been modelled and where required, mitigation measures proposed. Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (APP-048) of the Environmental Statement discusses this in more detail.
27.5	• Post-work concerns include an increase in noise as a result of the new route, due to topography and change in road surface will potentially have a significant impact to the running and future of the business. Noise surveys have been undertaken by Highways England, but have not been provided to the business as previously promised.	There was not a measurement position close to Sparkford Hall as it is located some way away from the scheme. Appendix 11.1 Baseline Noise Survey Results of the Environmental Statement (APP-090) discusses the noise survey data that was obtained. The Applicant has provided noise data for Sparkford Hall in response to a request by email, and a meeting has been scheduled to discuss this in person.
27.6	• The closure and loss of a public footpath which connects the property to the local village and public house, which customers use, will have an impact on the business. The mitigation of a new bridge would alleviate this concern. This has been suggested but not accepted by Highways England.	Noted.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
27.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation and other suggestions to reduce impact to the business and running during and post works have been suggested by the surveyor and owners of the business, but they have again been ignored. These include suggested diversions, possible earth bund, sound barriers and clearer and more detailed information provided to the public now. 	The Applicant does not believe that mitigation for the permanent solution is required. Mitigation and other suggestions to reduce impact to the business and running once the scheme is operational have been reviewed and the Applicant has responded to Mr. March Smith as to why the measures are not deemed applicable to the scheme. The Applicant has suggested a number of ways to work with Mr. March Smith during construction to ensure the works are suitably managed.
27.8	It is understood that some of the above claims may be claimable under Section 10 or Part 1 to Highways England after works. It is, however, preferable to the owners that co-operation and discussion with Highways England is forthcoming now to help reduce these potential claims.	Noted.
RR-028	Health and Safety Executive	
28.1	We have searched the Planning Inspectorate Consultation documentation for this Project but have not found specific mention of HSE's response under Section 42 of The Planning Act 2008. This has been updated below:	Noted.
28.2	With reference to the drawing (Drawing Number HE551507, Rev C01, 16/07/18) title RED LINE BOUNDARY PLAN REGULATION 5(2)(o) for Project A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling found in document A303_2.13_Red_Line_Boundary_Plan:	Noted.
28.3	1. There are currently no Major Hazard Installations in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	Noted.
28.4	2. There are currently no Major Accident Hazard Pipeline(s) (MAHP) in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	Noted.
28.5	Although there are currently no Major Hazard Installations or Major Accident Hazard Pipeline(s) (MAHP) in the vicinity of the proposed scheme, should a Hazardous Substances Consent [The Planning (hazardous Substances) (England) 2015 Regulations (as amended)] be granted prior to the determination of the present application, and/or HSE receives a notification under the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996 then the HSE reserves the right to revise its advice.	Noted.
RR-029	National Trust	
29.1	<p>Introduction</p> <p>The National Trust is Europe's largest conservation charity with over five million members. Established over 120 years ago, its primary purpose is to promote the preservation of special places for the benefit of the nation.</p> <p>The Trust is the custodian of several historic properties in South Somerset, including Lytes Cary Manor, a short distance to the west of the proposed road scheme (see applicant's Environmental Constraints Plan). Further down the A303 are Tintinhull Garden, Montacute House and St Michael's Hill, and Barrington Court. Together with a number of smaller NT properties, these form a notable component of South Somerset's tourism and visitor economy.</p> <p>The Trust is aware of the longstanding challenges of highway access to the South West via the A303 route corridor, and the benefits for local communities, visitors and the wider economy that could arise from road improvements. We broadly support the upgrading of the A303 between Sparkford to Ilchester, subject to the following comments.</p>	Noted.
29.2	<p>Natural and historic environments</p> <p>The proposed dualling falls some way short of (and involves no changes to) the Podimore roundabout, adjacent to Lytes Cary estate. Therefore, there are unlikely to be significant impacts on the landscape, views and settings of Trust properties. However, the proposed dual carriageway would pass over Camel Hill and includes new junctions and cuttings, so it may be visible in the wider landscape, including from Lytes Cary estate and in long distance views from St Michael's Hill. Any such impacts should be carefully considered, and ameliorated through detailed design and mitigation as appropriate (including new landscaping to provide screening, and minimising light pollution from any street lighting).</p> <p>In respect of ecology, surface water run-off from the new road is likely to enter the River Cary, which flows through the Lytes Cary estate downstream. Any potential water pollution should be carefully assessed and addressed through detailed design and mitigation; the same applies for other ecological impacts of the scheme. Ecological enhancements should be secured where possible.</p>	<p>Visual effects of the proposed scheme during construction and operation have been considered as part of Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044). Viewpoints, including long distant views beyond 1 kilometer were discussed and agreed as with South Somerset District Council as part of the environmental Technical Working Group (TWG). A viewpoint from Lytes Cary was considered as part of Chapter 7 Landscape but baseline surveys did not highlight the need to include St Michael's Hill long distance viewpoint within the assessment. Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043) considered certain known heritage assets in the wider landscape where potential for an impact was identified, which included St Michael's Hill at Montacute; however, no likely significant adverse effects were identified.</p> <p>The potential for adverse effects to water pollution have been assessed as part of Appendix 4.4 Highways Agency Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) Assessment (APP-057), and Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-056). In addition, ecological effects have been considered within Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (APP-045) and mitigation developed accordingly, as shown on Figure 2.8 Environmental Masterplan (APP-107). The HAWRAT Assessment would be undertaken again should the drainage strategy be amended as part of the detailed design stage.</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
29.3	Business impacts during construction The National Trust properties in South Somerset received 381,000 visitors in 2017/18, and the numbers have been growing over recent years. According to our own analysis, a high proportion of these visitors travel via the A303 between Sparkford and Ilchester. An estimated 79% of Trust members do so to access Lytes Cary (and 54% for Tintinhull, 43% for Montacute and 25% for Barrington). Given the above, we request that the Trust is identified as a stakeholder in the Traffic Management Plan, and that it is invited to be represented at the monthly traffic co-ordination meetings. In respect of traffic management, we would want advanced warning of road diversions and closures, in order to advise our visitors, and would ask for additional signage to reduce the impacts on our properties.	This request has been noted and the appointed Delivery Partner will be notified of this request.
29.4	Conclusion The Trust broadly supports the proposed road improvement between Sparkford and Ilchester and requests that the issues raised in this representation are given appropriate weight and attention through the DCO process, including through the use of Requirements where appropriate.	Noted.
RR-030	Greenslade Taylor Hunt on behalf of A W Hewlett & Son	
30.1	By letter from The Planning Inspectorate dated 18th October 2018, we have been requested to refer you to the written representation made by email to The Planning Inspectorate on 17th October 2018 at 13:14 together with all attachments.	Noted.
30.2	Attachment: Letter of objection	A number of site meetings have taken place with A W Hewlett & Son and their concerns are well understood. At the time of responding to the Representation, work is still ongoing. Once agreed, a position statement will be drafted.
RR-031	Strutt and Parker on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	
31.1	This representation is submitted by Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England (The Commissioners). The Commissioners are a registered Charity with land holdings across the country. The Commissioners' Yeovil estate is predominantly divided into two farms, Higher Farm and Courty & Speckington Farm. Both farms sit in close proximity to the current route of the A303 and access to parts of the two farms are heavily dependent upon it.	Noted.
31.2	The Commissioners, through their managing agents, have over the past year taken part in the consultation process for the Dualling of the Sparkford to Ilchester section of the A303, including attendance at several consultation events and through discussions with the project team at Highways England. The Commissioners and their farm tenants have also provided consent to enable preliminary survey works to be undertaken on the land owned by the Commissioners.	Noted.
31.3	This representation comments on specific features of the design for the A303 dualling scheme submitted by Highways England with the intended aim of ensuring that reasonable changes to the scheme are made to help mitigate our client's losses. This representation is broken down into three parts for separate parcels of land affected. A - Land at Higher Farm. Title Numbers, WS46264, WS46259, WS46247 B - Land at Courty & Speckington Farm (South of A303). Title Number WS46097 C - Land at Courty & Speckington Farm (North of A303). Title Number WS46095	Noted.
31.4 A 1	Land at Higher Farm. Title Numbers, WS46264, WS46259, WS46247 Our client welcomes the inclusion of an accommodation access running from Higher Farm lane to serve their land under title number WS46247. Are client disagrees that that the access provides them with a suitable alternative means of access. To ensure that the track is suitable for modern agricultural machinery, and provides a similar access provision, our client request the following; - That the access track is completed to at least 4.5 meters wide with cleared margins on either side of at least 1 meter. This is to allow the safe transition and maneuvering of large machinery, such as a combine harvester. All gates should also be of an appropriate width accordingly. - That the access track is constructed with a suitable hard wearing surface which shall require minimal maintenance. A reinforced concrete surface would be advisable to ensure that the high load of agricultural machinery can be accommodated. - That a gate is installed along the boundary of the accommodation access and title WS46247 to ensure that access can be gained to the retained land.	Preliminary accommodation works details have been developed and these will be consulted with relevant land-owners prior to completion of the DCO Examination

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
31.4 A 2	<p>Land at Higher Farm. Title Numbers, WS46264, WS46259, WS46247 Our client is concerned by the suggested outfall from pond 1 (Plot reference 1/4a), which appears to lead to their land under title number WS46264. From our review of the proposed drawings, this could lead to 3.47 hectares of the Highway area draining onto our client's land, which already low lying and suffering from poor drainage. This is significantly more than at present. We would contest that this is not a suitable place for such an outfall and it would be advisable to move the outfall to allow water to flow significantly further west along the highway in the direction of the Podimore roundabout. This could potentially connect to the existing culvert at the Higher Farm Lane overbridge, instead of the culvert running across my clients' land. The proposals by Highways England do not appear to show any works to the existing watercourse (ditch) which this outfall will flow into, to ensure it is of a suitable capacity. The proposals as they stand will have an adverse impact on our clients' land. Our client disagrees with the provision of drainage for the scheme.</p>	<p>The drainage strategy, including outfall locations and control measures for flood risk and pollution, is contained within the Drainage Strategy Report which is included as Appendix 4.7 of the Environmental Statement (APP-060)</p>
31.5 B 1	<p>Land at Courtry & Speckington Farm (South of A303). Title Number WS4609 Our client is again pleased to see that there needs for access to the western section of the above title have been considered and that an accommodation access is proposed from the B3151 to the east. Our client would however suggest that an accommodation access may not be required if a section of the ditch running through this title could be piped and a small section of hedgerow removed. Thus providing a means of access to the parcel. This would enable our client to farm the entire area of land within this title as one block and reduce accordingly the area of land take required. This would mitigate losses to my clients and have a significant reduction in the cost of the scheme to Highways England. We would welcome the opportunity to review this further with the project team. If the accommodation access is to be provided as detailed, then my client would request that the specification is the same as noted in respect of accommodation access serving the land at Higher Farm (see above comments).</p>	<p>See response to 31.4 A 1.</p>
31.5 B 2	<p>Land at Courtry & Speckington Farm (South of A303). Title Number WS46097 In respect of land to be permanent acquired, the land take in respect of parcel 2/5c appears somewhat excessive (in the southern portion), perhaps by up to 0.2 hectares. It also provides the field with a more awkward shape to farm which will further reduce the area that can be cropped. Our client disagrees that the amount of land take is reasonable in this location.</p>	<p>The General Arrangement Drawings (APP-102), highlight that this plot is required for works associated with the construction of the B3151 Link, including drainage and landscape planting works.</p>
31.5 B 3	<p>Land at Courtry & Speckington Farm (South of A303). Title Number WS46097 Our client is also significantly concerned that their current access from the B3151, on the most eastern tip of this land parcel, appears to be removed. This is a key access to the field for large machinery. My client does benefit from another access further west along the B3151, but this is not suitable for agricultural machinery in its current form. My client invites Highways England to consider options for suitable access provision to this parcel so that a wider parcel of land is not de-valued.</p>	<p>See response to 31.4 A 1.</p>
31.5 B 4	<p>Land at Courtry & Speckington Farm (South of A303). Title Number WS46097 Our client is also concerned that a significant portion of the new scheme is intended to be drained using the ditch that traverses their land under this title (and leads further west to my clients' title under title number WS46228). This field is already particularly wet and no proposals are made by Highways England to improve this ditch to ensure that it has suitable capacity (together with the waterways which it leads to). In total, an area of 24.34 hectares (catchments 2 & 3) together with existing drained area will eventually drain into this ditch. My client has significant concerns as to whether the existing field drainage and ditching will be able to cope with additional run off. We would invite Highways England to submit modelling to our client to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact from the drainage proposals onto our clients' land. The documents submitted by Highways England do not appear to demonstrate that the impact on this ditch has been modelled. Our client disagrees with the provision of drainage for the scheme.</p>	<p>The drainage strategy, including outfall locations and control measures for flood risk and pollution, is contained within the Drainage Strategy Report (APP-060) of the Environmental Statement</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
31.5 B 5	Land at Courtry & Speckington Farm (South of A303). Title Number WS46097 The land parcel also includes a works and material storage compound under parcel 2/5b. This area is at least 4.8 hectares and seems rather excessive for the proposed use. The allocated area almost appears somewhat arbitrator. Our client would request justification to show why such a large area is required by the scheme for the purpose outlined. Our client would also request detail of proposed ground protection measures and detail of what temporary drainage provision will be provided on the site to protect our clients neighbouring land from run off. The land is low lying with a heavy soil. During winter months, ground conditions can be extremely challenging. My client would therefore questions whether this parcel of land is indeed suitable for a site compound. If the land is utilised, my client and their tenant farmer will require access to the retained land to the west through the works site. Our client disagrees that the amount of temporary land take is reasonable in this location.	Highways England have commissioned buildability advice from its contracting supply chain. Its advisors have identified this plot as the most appropriate location and size for the main construction compound.
31.6 C 1	Land at Courtry & Speckington Farm (North of A303). Title Number WS46095 Again, our client welcomes the provision of an accommodation access that can serve their land, as the current entrance directly from the A303 will be closed. My client would request that the specification for this accommodation access as it leads from its most eastern extent to my clients' land in the west, is the same as noted in respect of accommodation access serving the land at Higher Farm (see above comments).	See response to 31.4 A 1.
31.6 C 2	Land at Courtry & Speckington Farm (North of A303). Title Number WS46095 The field included within this title is currently subject to arable cropping. The reduction in size, to approximately 5.7 acres may render it unsuitable for arable production in the future, particularly as the works will render it more severed from the remaining holding land it already is. To help mitigate the loss in value of the land, my client would request that Highways England securely stock proof fence the perimeter of the land so that it may be utilised by livestock in the future. Fencing along all stretches of land should bordering my clients land where works are to be undertaken should be of stock proof fencing, with a specification of pig netting, two strands of barbed wire with tantalised round posts with a lifespan of at least 30 years."	See response to 31.4 A 1.
RR-032	Greenslade Taylor Hunt on behalf of A W Hewlett & Son	
32.1	By letter from The Planning inspectorate dated 18th October 2018, we have been requested to refer you to the written representation made by email to The Planning Inspectorate on 17th October 2018 at 13:14 together with all attachments.	Noted.
32.2	Attachment: Letter of objection.	Noted.
RR-033	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	
33.1	The location for the proposed development occupies the any development aerodrome height, birdstrike and technical statutory safeguarding zones surrounding RNAS Yeovilton and the birdstrike statutory safeguarding zone surrounding Yeovil Airfield.	Noted.
33.2	In order for the appropriate assessments to be made to safeguard military radar and maintain air safety at the airbases, the MOD would require further information regarding the Above Ground Level (AGL) heights of machinery if piling is required for the proposed borehole drilling and also the details of any cranes or other tall pieces of equipment used during the construction of the road.	Noted.
33.3	The application site is within the birdstrike safeguarding zone, therefore any water bodies within this zone which could attract birds would be of concern to the MOD. The applicant should consider this when progressing the proposal and any water bodies should be designed in a way so they do not become an attractant to birds.	A bird strike risk assessment has been undertaken and this is not deemed to be an issue. The details of this have been appended to the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), which has been issued to the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) for discussion.
33.4	There are plans for five ponds to contain permanent standing water along the route of the proposed dual carriageway. The MOD has concerns these open bodies of water would potentially increase the risk of birdstrike to military aircraft operating around RNAS Yeovilton and Yeovil Airfield. Therefore, we would require further information regarding the function and design of the ponds as this proposal progresses.	See above.
33.5	In summary, with regards to the concerns identified above, please could DIO Safeguarding be consulted at any future planning / application stage of this development proposal.	Highways England are now holding regular meetings with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO), the next is in January 2019.
RR-034	Environment Agency	
34.1	The Environment Agency's Representation has been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate in the form of a pdf document, which, it has been agreed, will be attached to this form by the Inspectorate.	Noted.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
34.2	Following a detailed assessment of the submitted documentation, we have the following comments: It is noted that our national Protective Provisions have not been included in the draft DCO, as requested. The submitted draft Protective Provisions are not specific to our interests and do not accord with our requirements. Accordingly, we must advise that we are currently unable to agree to the proposed disapplication of legislative provisions pertinent to our interests, as detailed in Part 1 (3) of the draft DCO. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further.	The Applicant has separately prepared a detailed response to the forwarded draft protective provisions. The Applicant notes that the draft provided did not take account of the circumstances of this scheme and included provisions unprecedented in Highways England DCOs and which cannot be accepted. The Applicant has accordingly suggested alternative drafting to the Environment Agency.
34.3	Notwithstanding the above, we are essentially satisfied that, unless specifically stated hereunder, the supporting documentation and related provisions pertinent to our interests, including the draft 'Requirements', reflect earlier discussions and are currently considered sufficient to protect our interests. The Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary (Appendix 4.3 of the Environmental Statement) only considers licensed abstractions as potential receptors (section 1.4). We have previously advised of the presence of private supplies in the vicinity of the proposed works, that abstract quantities below the threshold requiring a licence. As previously advised, where used for potable water, such abstractions have a 50m radius Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1). We must again advise that a survey is conducted to ensure these sources are identified and adequately protected.	Private water supplies were an aspect that had been included in an agricultural questionnaire sent to all landowners perceived as potentially owning agricultural land within 250 metres of the red line boundary (as of Monday 5 March 2018). Questionnaires were sent to 69 landowners, and 24 questionnaires were returned. The returned questionnaires have subsequently been reviewed and a technical note is currently being prepared which will be issued to the Environment Agency shortly. The returned questionnaires have subsequently been reviewed and a technical note has been prepared and issued to the Environment Agency for their information. The technical note concludes that no adverse impacts on deregulated abstractions / private water supplies are anticipated to occur as a result of the scheme during either construction or operational phases.
34.4	Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement also fails to consider unlicensed groundwater abstractions. Whilst we agree that there are no Source Protection Zones attributed to public water supplies in the vicinity of the scheme, there are likely to be default 50m radius SPZ1 around private abstractions within the area of study.	Private water supplies were an aspect that had been included in an agricultural questionnaire sent to all landowners perceived as potentially owning agricultural land within 250 metres of the red line boundary (as of Monday 5 March 2018). Questionnaires were sent to 69 landowners, and 24 questionnaires were returned. The returned questionnaires have subsequently been reviewed and a technical note is currently being prepared which will be issued to the Environment Agency shortly. The technical note concludes that no adverse impacts on deregulated abstractions / private water supplies are anticipated to occur as a result of the scheme during either construction or operational phases.
34.5	We note that it is not currently considered feasible for runoff to be actively discharged to ground due to the low permeability nature of the soils. The Highways Agency Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) does not therefore appear to have been applied to groundwater. Should the drainage strategy change following results from the on-going groundwater monitoring, additional assessment should be undertaken to ensure the risks to groundwater in the underlying Secondary A aquifer are acceptable. Should sections of the drainage system allow potential infiltration through unlined infrastructure, assessment of the risk posed to groundwater must be undertaken in respect of such discharges and appropriate pollution control measures incorporated.	Should the drainage strategy as submitted as part of the DCO application be amended following results of the Ground Investigation, for example through use of infiltration features which subsequently would require discharge into groundwater, the Highways Agency Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) Assessment would need to be updated (APP-057) and re-submitted during the Examination. This is considered to be a low risk.
34.6	Part 4 Section 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order requires that water discharged into a watercourse must be as free as practicable of solid substances, matter in suspension and oil. To ensure controlled waters are adequately protected, we must request the extension of the requirement to include dissolved pollutants and discharges to ground, due to the potential for pollution of groundwater in the underlying Secondary A aquifer.	The Applicant has been made aware of this request. The outcomes of the draft DCO and the amendments made will be shared with the Environment Agency in due course, and therefore this topic is still 'under discussion' for now.
34.7	We welcome 'Requirement' 8 (Land and Groundwater Contamination) which details the need for a land contamination risk assessment with respect to controlled waters and, if required, a remediation strategy to be submitted for approval following consultation with the Environment Agency.	Noted.
34.8	Notwithstanding the above, we would recommend the following with regard to contaminated land management: 1. Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination. 2. Refer to the Environment Agency Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that we required in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. 3. Consider using the National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed. 4. Refer to the contaminated land pages on GOV.UK for more information.	As stated within paragraph 9.9.24 of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils of the Environmental Statement (APP-046), the Contaminated Land Risk Assessment (CLRA) will be prepared in accordance with the Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination (CLR11). The additional guidance documents will also be considered.
34.9	We must advise that 'Requirement' 3 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) is amended to include a specific need to submit a Pollution Incident Control Plan, to ensure environmental pollution prevention and emergency response procedures are developed and implemented. The measures must be appropriate to the potential risk of the specific works being undertaken, impacting upon identified environmental receptors.	The Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148) will be updated to include this commitment, to ensure it is carried through when the management plan is updated to a full Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The Applicant has been made aware of the potential change to the draft DCO.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
34.10	Further, it is noted that 'Requirement' 3 does not specify consultation with the Environment Agency. Due to potential risks to environmental receptors during construction we would request that we have the opportunity to comment on the CEMP and also the HEMP to ensure longer term risks can be adequately mitigated. With reference to the record of sensitive environmental features and Groundwater Monitoring Strategy, we may hold information that would assist in determining sensitive environmental receptors.	Requirement 3 and the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148) will be updated to include this commitment, to ensure it is carried through when the management plan is updated to a full Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
34.11	We must advise that any subsequent documentation submitted pursuant to the discharge of any 'Requirement' pertinent to our interests, is forwarded for our consideration, prior to any approval or otherwise.	The Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148) will be updated to include this commitment, to ensure it is carried through when the management plan is updated to a full CEMP. The Applicant has been made aware of the potential change to the draft DCO.
34.12	With regard to our flood risk management remit, we would reiterate that the proposals lie outside Flood Zones 2 and 3 and, as a consequence, there are no specific/direct flood risk mitigation works required to ensure the proposed scheme will be protected against fluvial/tidal risks from sources under our jurisdiction. The applicant is advised to (if not done so already) assess any local flood risks to the proposed scheme from nearby ditches and drains under the control of the Lead Local Flood Authority or Drainage Board.	Local flood risks have been assessed and included within the Drainage Strategy (see Appendix 4.7 Drainage Strategy Report, APP-060) and the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6 Flood Risk Assessment, APP-059) following consultation with Somerset Drainage Board Consortium and the Lead Local Flood Authority.
34.13	We would advise that draft 'Requirement' 13 does not appear to make any provision for the future management/maintenance of the approved drainage details. This will be important to ensure the drainage system continues to perform as originally designed, for the lifetime of the scheme.	This point has been addressed in correspondence with the Environment Agency.
34.14	It is noted that in section 5 of requirement 13, there may be an issue for the other Risk Management Authorities to comment on i.e. points a) and b) suggest no surcharge at 1 in 1 yr (100%AEP) events, and no flooding at 1 in 5 yr (20%AEP) events. This would appear to be a low standard of service for a new road drainage network. Typically, no surcharge would be expected up to and including 5%AEP (1 in 20yr) in the drainage network, with no surface flooding at 1%AEP (1 in 100yr) events. Exceedance design should cover the climate change scenario at 1%AEP. Accordingly, the respective Risk Management Authorities should clarify their expected standards for the performance of the road drainage network.	The proposed highway drainage as part of the scheme has been designed in accordance with the standards included within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), as stated within Table 6.1 of the Drainage Strategy Report (see Appendix 4.7 Drainage Strategy Report, APP-060). As stated within Section 6.4 of the Drainage Strategy Report (see Appendix 4.7 Drainage Strategy Report, APP-060), the rainfall intensities used to calculate the design storms include an allowance for the effects of climate change by allowing for a 40% increase.
34.15	As previously advised, the draft Statement of Common Ground should be amended to also include issues which remain outstanding. In our experience, a concise document detailing all agreed and unresolved issues provides the Examining Inspector(s) with an easy reference source document. Accordingly, clear reference should be made to the need to undertake the aforementioned unlicensed groundwater abstractions assessment, which has been raised on numerous occasions. Further, it is noted the Statement of Common Ground (Table 1.1) only refers to meetings, with no reference to written correspondence. This aspect should be amended to reflect the full extent of engagement. With reference to paragraph 1.2.3 of the Statement of Common Ground, the applicant is advised to include the following outline of our role: The Environment Agency is an executive non-departmental public body, sponsored by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs with the stated purpose "to protect or enhance the environment, taken as a whole". Within England it is responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regulating major industry and waste; • treatment of contaminated land; • water quality and resources; • fisheries; • some inland river, estuary and harbour navigations; • conservation and ecology; and • managing the risk of flooding from main rivers, reservoirs, estuaries and the sea. 	The Statement of Common Ground between Highways England and the Environment Agency has been updated to include the issues that remain outstanding. Email correspondence will also be included within the appendix of the Statement of Common Ground. The Environment Agency's role has been updated accordingly.
RR-035	Friends of the Earth	
35.1	The technical data presented for the examination of the A303 Sparkford – Ilchester scheme treat it as a standalone project. It clearly is not. Highways England's own justification of "why we need this scheme" starts by stating: "The A303/A358 corridor is a vital connection between the south west, London and the south east. While much of the route is a dual carriageway, there are still over 35 miles of single carriageway" – and it is clear from much of their promotional material, and Ministerial statements, that the scheme is to be viewed as part of a wider strategy to create an A303 "expressway" of continuous dual carriageway standard between the south east and the south west.	The appraisal of the scheme has been carried out in accordance with the Department for Transport's WebTAG guidance. The assumptions used for forecasting have been developed in accordance with the guidance in WebTAG Unit M4. The appraisal is summarised in the Appraisal Summary Table based on core scenario forecasts which should represent the most unbiased and realistic set of assumptions. All forecasting uncertainties are summarised in the uncertainty log which is contained in the Combined Modelling Appraisal (ComMA) report (APP-151). This identifies future infrastructure and developments as near certain; more than likely; reasonably foreseeable or hypothetical. Those categorised as near certain and more than likely are included in the core scenario. This assumes that the other Road Investment Strategy 2015 to 2020 2 schemes will be completed so assumes completion of the A358 Taunton to

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
35.2	The scheme appraisal looks very much as though it discounts the cumulative effects of this strategy. Two other schemes in the same corridor, A303 Stonehenge and A358 Taunton to Southfields, are explicitly scoped out as having "no cumulative effects" (ref APP-051). The transport report (ref APP-150) predicts traffic increases of 15-20% over "do minimum" by 2038 – a maximum daily flow on A303 of 43600 with dualling as against 36300 in the "do minimum" case (and 23400 present day). This includes some local re-assignment away from other roads in the area.	Southfields Dualling and A303 Stonehenge schemes are completed and therefore included in the forecasts with the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling scheme, as well as without it. Whilst it is the government's aspiration to upgrade the whole of the A303 route, the other improvements required on the corridor to achieve this are not in a currently funded plan and consequently it would not be appropriate at this time to assess the impacts of these schemes which may or may not be progressed in the future.
35.3	We request that the examining body seeks confirmation of this, but it looks very much as though these forecasts are based on dualling only the Sparkford – Ilchester section of A303, not the corridor as a whole. In other words, what is being appraised is not what is actually proposed.	
35.4	A Freedom of Information request to Highways England has so far failed to elicit forecasts for the traffic increases resulting from dualling of the A303/A358 corridor as a whole. It should be noted however that the 2002 SWARMMS study predicted daily flows of 55000 vehicles on this section of A303 if the corridor as a whole were dualled. This is 12% more than the flow that is used as the basis for modelling in the Environmental Statement, 50% more than "do minimum", and 135% more than the present day. Many adverse impacts will be correspondingly greater.	
35.5	We appreciate that the examining body has to consider the scheme it is presented with and cannot recommend on the project to dual the A303 as a whole. Nevertheless, since that is the context within which the A303 Sparkford – Ilchester scheme so clearly sits, we believe that it is misleading to put it through examination as though the other elements of the overall strategy did not exist.	
RR-036	Iain Aird	
36.1	I have concerns regarding inaccurate and possibly misleading entries to the "book of reference".	We have contacted Mr. Aird to clarify the inaccuracies referred to in his Relevant Representation and will review these once clarified.
36.2	I am also concerned there is a danger to traffic regarding the siting of the temporary (haulage/non road legal vehicle) road on Camel Hill	The haul road will be fenced, with manned gates where required. Construction traffic and non-construction traffic will not be allowed to mix.
36.3	There needs to be some sort of pedestrian/cyclist access (underpass or light bridge) from Camel Hill to Gason Lane as the current proposal is neither helpful nor safe and appears VERY dangerous for a cyclist or pedestrian to access local amenities in the village.	It is not clear which village the Representation is referring to, although it is assumed that is Queen Camel. The existing arrangement at this location is an at-grade crossing of the A303 between rights of way WN23/10 (near Gason Lane) and WN23/33 (Camel Hill). Traffic modelling predicts that the annual average daily 2-way traffic along the A303 at this location in the opening year (2023) will be 33,700. This crossing is being closed as part of the draft DCO. A new NMU route is being proposed between Gason Lane and Camel Hill which follows points BL-BK-BJ-BI-BH-BG-BF-BE-BY-BD as shown on sheets 3 and 4 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans (APP-007). This imposes an additional 1.5 kilometres travel distance on the non-motorised user although is almost entirely off carriageway and passes underneath the dualled A303 at the Hazlegrove Underbridge. There is only one road crossing along this route (Camel Hill Link). The opening year annual average daily traffic along Camel Hill Link at third location is expected to be 1,400. Whilst this is a longer journey than the existing arrangement it is considered to be much safer as vulnerable users will be exposed to significantly less traffic.
RR-037	Mike Lewis	
37.1	As the elected Somerset County Councilor for Castle Cary Division which includes the villages of Babcary, Podimore, Queen Camel, Sparkford and West Camel which straddle the proposed dualling of the A303 I wish to strongly support the joint submission by Somerset County Council and South Somerset District Council plus the joint and individual submissions by Queen Camel, Sparkford and West Camel.	Noted.
37.2	One issue that impacts on all the local communities including Babcary and Podimore is FLOODING; exaggerated by the water run off from the A303 and impacting on the local and communities especially down stream on the river Cam. It is my contention that insufficient consideration has been given to flood alleviation and mitigation measures as the direct experience of the local communities does not match data provided by the Environment Agency.	A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been undertaken for the proposed scheme, presented within Appendix 4.6 of the Environmental Statement (APP-059). The FRA considered the flood risk from all sources of flooding to and from the proposed site. The entirety of the scheme is within Flood Zone 1. The assessment identified survey water runoff as the most significant risk and through implementation of the proposed drainage strategy, as detailed within Appendix 4.7 Drainage Strategy Report of the Environmental Statement (APP-060), the scheme will not increase flood risk elsewhere, further improving upon the baseline condition.
37.3	The HGV Management Plan for the A359 between Sparkford and Yeovil restricting such vehicles to 7½ tons both during and post construction will need to be rigidly enforced, as well as further speed reduction measures for Sparkford High Street and Howell Hill and Plowage Lane in West Camel.	Noted.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
37.4	The elevated section of the proposed dualling will in my view have a significant impact on the 3 main communities to the south of the A303 and will need greater protection than currently envisaged.	The effects of the elevated section of the proposed scheme on the 3 main communities have been assessed as part of the landscape and visual impact assessment contained within Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044). Figure 7.5 Visual Receptor Plan (APP-121) shows a number of visual receptors located within Podimore, West Camel and Queen Camel as well as at other locations to the south of the existing A303. During construction, significant effects would be anticipated for visual receptor 20 (view from southern extent of Howell Hill Road representative of residential receptors to the northern extent of West Camel immediately adjacent). All other visual receptors within these communities during construction would not be anticipated to be significant.
37.5	It is proposed by Highways England that Traits Lane and the Podimore slip road be blocked up post construction. It would be really helpful if this occurred prior to the commencement of construction, and during 2019. This has the support of the communities affected by these proposals.	Any work associated with the scheme cannot be commenced prior to the Development Consent Order (DCO) being granted, which is scheduled to take place at the end of 2019. Work is planned to commence shortly after the DCO is granted. A detailed construction schedule has not yet been developed.
37.6	Comments on the Sparkford/ Hazlegrove junction has been commented on elsewhere.	Noted.
RR-038	Nicholas Aleksander	
38.1	I have homes both in Devon and in London, and regularly use the A303 to travel between them. The A303 is heavily used, and those parts that are single carriageway cannot cope with the level of traffic - and jams occur at the various transitions from dual to single. The proposal is essential to ensuring that there are good communication links between the South West of the UK and the rest of the country	Noted.
RR-039	Roy Lawrenson	
39.1	<p>1. LOCATION</p> <p>The entrance to the road will be 4 metres from our door and bedrooms. Heavy vehicular traffic will be entering and exiting directly under our bedroom windows during the early hours of the morning and late at night. The noise, light and diesel pollution from stationary vehicles as gates are opened and closed will be unacceptable and a HEALTH ISSUE for our family. The entrance of the proposed road will be situated between two blind bends on a single track unclassified road. The exact PROPOSED LOCATION WAS DEEMED A SAFETY ISSUE by LOCAL PLANNERS when [redacted] applied for planning permission and a condition of planning was that 'any vehicular entrance must be located 50 metres east'. The proposed site access area is currently a matter of grave concern with 3 head on collisions in the last two years on this specific spot. The County Councillor (Mike Lewis), the Parish Council and the Hamlet of Wales residents are currently in talks with SSDC Highways and Highways England about the risks and dangers to vehicle users, pedestrians and horse riders on this very lane.</p> <p>The road would also require significant ancient hedging to be removed causing unnecessary environmental damage.</p>	The Applicant has met with Mr. Lawrenson several times since the submission of this Relevant Representation and it is now proposed to remove this proposed access track from the DCO submission. The Applicant has informed Mr. Lawrenson of this proposal, but it has been made clear that permission will have to be obtained from The Planning Inspectorate to amend the application and a consultation will take place with affected parties. The formal request to change the red line boundary will be submitted during the course of the Examination.
39.2	<p>2. FLOODING</p> <p>We live in the highest risk ZONE 3 flood area. The proposed road comes off a 70m elevation slope and faces directly onto Blackwell Lane which floods each year as a direct result of run-off water from the hill. Any impaction of soil heightens the displacement of water and causes greater risk to nearby properties. At the proposed exit of the road the River Cam runs directly along Blackwell Lane causing aqua planing of vehicles and risk of them entering the river. (Photo evidence available).</p> <p>When our house flooded in 2008 it came in from the road side breaching flood defenses of over 70 cm, again as a direct result of run-off from the hill opposite. The environment agency confirmed in correspondence to the owner of [redacted] that the local flooding was as a direct result of heavy rain running off the hills.</p> <p>A flood assessment report and a groundsure report for [redacted] confirms that there is significant risk of flood from the North with water running down the hill onto the road and into the house. There are three key factors which heighten the risk of flooding to our house. The farmer has recently built a cow shed with a 50 x20 metre concrete base on the mid section of the hill causing hydro displacement, the A303 will be building directly on top of the hill and now a proposed access road would be built on the same ground. Each proposal viewed in isolation is significant in terms of hydro displacement but viewed together the risk is exponential.</p>	

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
39.3	<p>3. NEED FOR ROAD EASEMENT</p> <p>The farm access from Blackwell Lane up Traits Lane will remain open during the A303 development and is marginal in distance difference from the proposed easement road. The corner between Blackwell Lane and Traits Lane is tight but could easily be modified at a fraction of the cost. Any modification would still be on the owner's land because he owns all of the aforementioned corner.</p> <p>My understanding that the road would be temporary but I cannot ascertain where the access will revert to.</p>	
RR-040	Somerset County Council	
40.1	The proposed dualling of the A303 between Sparkford and Ilchester is within the administrative boundaries of South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council and therefore the 'Councils' are host authorities and statutory consultees in the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.	Noted.
40.2	This relevant representation reiterates the Councils' support for the dualling scheme. However, the Councils wish to ensure that the development does not result in unacceptable impacts on the residents, businesses and environment of the affected local area. We have therefore taken the opportunity to highlight issues that should be considered by the Planning Inspectorate at the Examination.	Noted.
40.3	The Councils note that the scheme submitted is still only at preliminary design stage, and whilst advanced, is not finalised. On this basis, further localised impacts or issues may emerge and these will be presented to the Examining Authority as further information comes forward. There therefore continues to be a considerable volume of work that remains to be done and it is essential that the Councils have adequate resources provided to perform their functions. The Councils are disappointed that negotiations for a Planning Performance Agreement were unsuccessful which has limited their capacity and ability to fully assess the submitted DCO within the timeframes available. A detailed assessment of the scheme by the Councils is therefore ongoing. The Councils also have concerns in the context of having a fair chance to put their case and ensuring an adequate examination of the issues.	Noted.
40.4	The comments listed below are intended as a summary, which will be further developed and detailed within the emerging Written Representations, Local Impact Report and Statements of Common Ground.	Noted.
40.5	<p>Impact on the Local Highway Network</p> <p>The Councils have previously advised the applicant during the pre-application stage that a Transport Assessment should be prepared to confirm that the proposed layout is appropriate in traffic terms. It is understood that this has not been prepared but the applicant has prepared and submitted a CoMMA Report and Transport Report which includes technical modelling data.</p> <p>Review of the modelling data has shown that the scheme is likely to increase traffic through the communities of West Camel and Sparkford. Whilst this is understood from review of the technical data, it is unclear why the impacts on these local areas, which could be more wide-ranging than just increased traffic and include for example impact on cultural heritage or ecology, are not described in detail within the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapters and we consider that there may be residual impacts which may need to be mitigated. We note that communities have raised concerns about increased traffic and we understand that the applicant is willing to make funds available to address this in West Camel; Sparkford is still being considered. Traffic calming measures and other mitigation measures should therefore be explored and considered through the DCO process with any additional impacts of this considered, and a mechanism established to secure this mitigation.</p> <p>The Local Impact Area does not appear to include the locations of West Camel, Queen Camel or Podimore Roundabout. We originally recommended to Highways England that a "wider sphere of influence may be required to capture the wider scheme impacts....." it would appear that this hasn't been taken into account and therefore it appears that a significant amount of scheme impact has not been included within the report.</p> <p>In addition, the CoMMA report includes operational traffic assessments of the proposed junctions but the assessment has shown potential issues around the junction of Sparkford High Street - The Avenue and Podimore Roundabout. In the absence of an explanation of these issues as part</p>	Changes to traffic movements from the scheme which have the potential to impact on the setting of heritage assets have been assessed as part of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043). During both construction and operation, there are not anticipated to be any significant adverse effects on cultural heritage within the communities of West Camel or Sparkford associated with traffic. Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044) has assessed the construction and operational effects to the Conservation Areas (of which West Camel is designated as one); no significant adverse effects are anticipated during either construction or operation. A Statement of Common Ground is being pursued with South Somerset District Council which includes an element in relation to traffic.

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme
Comments on Relevant Representations

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
	<p>of the ES it is suggested that the applicant provides their view on the impacts and comment on whether the impact warrants appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>SCC as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been working with the applicant's designer since January 2018, providing comments on technical submissions related to new local road provision; provision for non-motorised users; signage and road markings; structures; construction proposals; drainage; and street lighting. In addition, matters relating to maintenance provision and extents of responsibility; regulatory measures on local roads; and de-trunking works have also been discussed, but again are at an early stage of agreement.</p> <p>The technical elements do still require agreement through developed detailed design; however, it is noted that the detailed designs are not yet programmed to be progressed until appointment of a further designer and potentially after conclusion of the examination. SCC considers that the outstanding issues are capable of being resolved, however, SCC will require provision within the wording of the DCO for the LHA to approve the remaining detailed design elements and agreement for the associated fees associated with this. At present it is considered that such a commitment is not yet contained within the DCO.</p> <p>For those sections which fall to the responsibility of the LHA under DCO de-trunking procedures, it is normal practice for the LHA to be compensated by Highways England for the additional maintenance burden the roads will present to the Council. The compensatory arrangements have not yet been agreed including the end uses of all redundant sections of the A303 route.</p>	
<p>40.6 A</p>	<p>Public Rights of Way The information in the various documents and Draft DCO where shown in detail, is generally an accurate portrayal of the recorded public rights of way. Some of the more schematic figures of the whole application area would appear to have minor errors, but not sufficient to be of concern.</p> <p>The LHA does have some concerns in relation to the methodology for assessing the usage of the network; by not covering full daylight hours, nor weekend days, the results of non-motorised user surveys is not considered entirely representative of the actual use.</p>	<p>The survey methodology and results are summarised in Appendix 12.1 of the Environmental Statement (APP-093). This document explains that 2 sets of surveys were conducted in 2016. One survey was undertaken during the summer holiday period (albeit on weekdays) and one survey was undertaken during term time in September (again, during weekdays).</p> <p>The objective of the surveys was to capture a snap-shot of the overall level of usage of rights of way, and in this respect the results have proved useful. The surveys highlighted a selection of relatively well used rights of way within an area that is otherwise lightly used. It is not considered that results during daylight evenings or weekends on this relatively lightly trafficked network would have provided a significantly different conclusion, given that the surveys were undertaken in good weather and during school holidays.</p>
<p>40.6 B</p>	<p>Public Rights of Way In general the analysis of the impact of the development is a fair portrayal with one particular exception in relation to public bridleway Y 30/28. The LHA has concerns in relation to the impact of the stopping up of the connection of Y30/28 with the A303. The current proposal from the applicant is provision of a route east to the nearest new vehicular overbridge.</p> <p>The applicant, in line with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, is expected to take appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse effects on public rights of way. The LHA considers that the proposed mitigation, whilst beneficial to the overall network is not the most appropriate. The length of the alternative route proposed by the applicant is c.5.2km for walkers, cyclists and equestrians. If instead the alternative was over Y 30/UN (now labelled Y 30/31), this length would be reduced to c.1.5km. This is a considerable difference in length and convenience.</p> <p>In addition to the recorded network of Public Rights of Way, there are potentially unrecorded rights that may exist which the development will interfere with. Given the potential impact of the scheme it is considered that the possible outcomes of current applications to modify the Definitive Map and Statement would necessitate a mechanism to be included within the DCO which safeguards the provision of such rights in the future if and when they are confirmed.</p>	<p>Eastmead Lane (Right of Way reference Y30/28) is scheduled in draft DCO Schedule 4 Part 1 as being stopped up at its junction with the eastbound carriageway of the A303 at the far eastern end of the dual carriageway Podimore Bypass. There are currently 2 journeys available to NMUs that involve the use of this section of Y30/28. These are (a) travel along the eastbound A303 from the Podimore roundabout and then turn northbound along Eastmead Lane, and (b) travel southbound along Eastmead Lane and then join the A303 eastbound towards Downhead Lane.</p> <p>(NB it is considered that interchange between Eastmead Lane and the existing A303 westbound carriageway is not possible due to central hatching road markings on the A303 carriageway at this location).</p> <p>The amendment to Y30/UN that is proposed in this Representation would not mitigate for the impact on either of the 2 journeys described above. Taking each of these journeys in turn the alternative route available under the scheme would be (a) continue along the A303 eastbound carriageway until Downhead Junction, leave the A303 at this junction and then join Downhead Lane, and then join Track 2 to head westwards until Eastmead Lane is reached, and (b) from Eastmead Lane turn east along Track 2 and join Downhead Lane at the end of Track 2.</p> <p>The proposed journey associated with (a) is likely to be approximately 4.2 kilometres longer than the current journey, and the proposed journey associated with (b) is unlikely to be significantly different. It is also noteworthy that the scheme proposals avoid travel along the A303 entirely.</p>
<p>40.6 C</p>	<p>Public Rights of Way In addition to the recorded network of Public Rights of Way, there are potentially unrecorded rights that may exist which the development will interfere with. Given the potential impact of the scheme it is considered that the possible outcomes of current applications to modify the Definitive Map and Statement would necessitate a mechanism to be included within the DCO which safeguards the provision of such rights in the future if and when they are confirmed.</p>	<p>At the time of the submission of the draft DCO, the Applicant were aware of one such application for a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) that was relevant to this scheme. This was Modification No 859. The published scheme accommodates this potential modification.</p> <p>It will be necessary for Somerset County Council to advise the Examining Authority which additional DMMO applications it has received, and for the examination process to consider if these can be accommodated</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
40.7	<p>Impact on Air Quality Having reviewed all the information provided with this application, we are satisfied that the baseline information and assessment methods used in respect of air quality modelling is satisfactory. Whilst there appears to be no significant changes to air quality from the proposed scheme itself and as such, no mitigation measures have been proposed, there are two areas of concern to the Council, West Camel and Sparkford High Street where it is predicted the scheme will result in significantly increased traffic movements which may have an adverse effect on air quality. Further investigation is needed to ensure these areas will not exceed air quality limits and to determine whether appropriate mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>within the scheme. Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement (APP-042) outlines the assessment undertaken to assess the air quality impact during operation of the scheme at worst affected receptors. This includes consideration of the impact at Hazel Grove Lodge on Sparkford High Street. The assessment concludes that concentrations of PM10 and NO2 at these human health receptors are expected to be well below the respective air quality objectives. The predicted effects from the operation of the scheme on local air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed. The impact at receptors in West Camel is not significant because the predicted change in traffic flows through West Camel on Fore Street is below the criteria for assessment, as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance. Nonetheless, "The Hollies" on Plowage Lane which is located adjacent to the existing A303 has been modelled. This receptor is predicted to experience an improvement in air quality as a result of the Scheme due to the change in alignment of the A303 (the A303 moves further away from the receptor).</p>
40.8	<p>Impact on Noise and Vibration Having reviewed the information provided, we are satisfied that the baseline information in respect of noise and vibration is satisfactory, the assessment methods used are appropriate and the presentation of the results clearly demonstrate the likely effects the proposed scheme will have during construction and when in operation. It is expected and understood that Best Practice Measures will be implemented during construction to mitigate the adverse effects of noise and vibration. Approval is to be obtained from the District Council through the Section 61 process which will ensure any mitigation identified will have no residual significant impacts. It is noted that there are 2 properties that will be significantly affected by operational noise once the scheme is open to traffic, however, the mitigation embedded in the scheme design and secondary double glazing for the 2 properties will be sufficient to mitigate the effects of the operational noise. We however have concerns about the proposed scheme causing significant increases in traffic on Sparkford High Street and West Camel and the subsequent increase in noise as a result of this.</p>	<p>On the particular issue of the Sparkford Community - the noise increase of up to 1.3dB (paragraph 11.10.61 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement, APP-048) is due to increased traffic on Sparkford High Street. This is because the scheme will reduce journey times between Sparkford and Ilchester making the route via the High Street more attractive to vehicles travelling from Frome to destinations south-west of Ilchester and vice-versa. It is expected that some traffic that currently uses the A361 and A37 for this route would divert to using the A361, A359 and A303 so increasing the traffic along Sparkford High Street.</p>
40.9	<p>Impact on Cultural Heritage The scheme is within an area of high historic and cultural value and whilst the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which is the accepted methodology for infrastructure projects, and sets out a logical sequence for assessment and review, the assessment for some assets is queried. The increased traffic in West Camel and Sparkford may require mitigation. Any traffic calming measures that are required as a direct outcome of the dualling works should be included in the DCO and their effects on Conservation Areas and associated cultural heritage assessed. Such measures should assess the impact on the character and appearance of a conservation area or setting of a listed building and impact of traffic-induced vibration on the structural integrity of historic buildings and structures. Given that the traffic modelling for the scheme indicates an increase in HGV traffic as a direct outcome of the dualling works, it is recommended that traffic-induced vibration on historic buildings and structures, and increased traffic loads on Camel Bridge are assessed. Whilst mitigation measures are outlined with the application, additional mitigation is required, details of which will be outlined in the Written Representations and Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>The impact on the character and appearance of a conservation area or setting of a listed building of historic buildings and structures has been assessed as part of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-046). During construction, there are not anticipated to be any significant adverse effects to Conservation Areas or Listed Buildings as a result of increases in local traffic in West Camel and Sparkford, as outlined in Table 6.4 Significant Construction Effects of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-046). Once operational, there are not anticipated to be any significant adverse effects to Conservation Areas or Listed Buildings as a result of increases in local traffic, as outlined within Table 6.5 Significant Operational Effects of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-046).</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
40.10	<p>Impact on Archaeology</p> <p>The data does not currently include the full suite of field investigations required to assess the significance or impacts of heritage assets. The applicant has carried out a geophysical survey of the scheme and is currently engaged in trial trenching. The applicant's archaeological consultants have been in contact with the South West Heritage Trust (SWHT) and Written Schemes of Investigation for the survey and trial trenching have been agreed. The geophysical survey has indicated archaeological potential across areas of the scheme. The SWHT is engaged in monitoring of the trial trenching (in conjunction with HE where appropriate) and this is progressing well.</p> <p>It is understood that the results of the fieldwork will be submitted during the application process and so it is envisaged that all required information will be available prior to any determination.</p> <p>The documents that have been submitted are accepted as meeting the requirements of the initial phase of the assessment. The later submission of the geophysical survey and trial trenching will enable a mitigation strategy to be designed. At present it is not possible to comment fully on the ES Chapter and issues associated with the impacts on archaeology.</p>	<p>As detailed within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043), the results of the archaeological investigations will be submitted as other environmental information to support the Development Consent Order (DCO) application during the examination period. The results will help to develop specific mitigation measures to be detailed within a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which will be prepared during Detailed Design and is a requirement of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (APP-148).</p>
40.11	<p>Impact on Landscape</p> <p>The methodology for establishing the landscape and visual baseline in the ES is comprehensive and clearly sets out the study area, designated sites, landscape character and its sensitivity to change, and the visual baseline and its sensitivity to change. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the DMRB, Interim Advice Note 135/10 Landscape and Visual Effects Assessments (replacing parts of the DMRB) and the Landscape Institute Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessments. The DMRB is the accepted methodology for infrastructure projects and the Landscape Institute guidance is a long-established industry tool.</p> <p>The assessment for the likely effects is challenged for a number of visual receptors and requires reassessment. A number of measures and additional information are recommended to the landscape design to improve the impact on the landscape its appreciation from visual receptors. These will be detailed in the Written Representations and Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044) has been produced to report the likely effects on landscape and visual as a result of the scheme, during both construction and operation. The landscape design has been developed as part of an iterative design development process, and the mitigation will be reviewed during the detailed design stage.</p>
40.12 a	<p>Impact on Biodiversity</p> <p>The information presented is generally accurate but there are some omissions and these have been raised at Highways England Technical Working Groups and officers are working to progress matters. Any outstanding matters will be raised in the Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (APP-045) has been produced to report the likely effects on biodiversity as a result of the scheme, during both construction and operation. Questions raised by the County Ecologist are being addressed as part of the ongoing Environmental Technical Working Group (TWG).</p>
40.12 b	<p>Approximately 91 hectares of habitat clearance would be undertaken as part of the proposed scheme, 77.4 hectares would be temporarily damaged and 13.7 hectares permanently removed. Whilst overall it is suggested that there would be a net gain in biodiversity, this is unclear and requires evidencing using the use of metrics.</p>	<p>It has been agreed with Natural England that the use of the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) metric is not appropriate for this scheme.</p>
40.12 c	<p>The loss of hedgerows and woodland is concerning. The replanting and replacement of mature trees on a 1 for 1 basis is insufficient and new planting should be on a 3 for 1 basis which would allow for natural losses. An appropriate ecological management plan will need to be in place to ensure that all the re-created habitats are managed to the intended habitat and for the duration of the scheme.</p>	<p>The largest block of woodland to be lost (1.33 hectares) is south of Hazlegrove House. This woodland is poorly structured with limited understory and a species composition not indicative of ancient woodland. Other small areas of broadleaved semi-natural woodland and plantation woodland will be lost but the structure/ species composition did not indicate ancient woodland. There will be a substantial net gain of woodland habitat as a result of the scheme. There is a net loss of hedgerow of 91.91 metres. However, hedgerow to be lost includes some defunct and species poor hedgerows. Habitat planting will comprise species rich hedgerows.</p>
40.12 d	<p>Of particular concern is the hedgerow east of Canegore Corner, no mitigation measures are proposed to counteract the effect of the proposed road construction on bats or other species, or for proposed species crossing the new A303 once operational. It is recommended that a "green bridge" be considered here and underpasses elsewhere as the opportunity exits.</p>	<p>We are proposing a bat hop-over at this location. Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (App-045) states that this hop-over will be formed of more permanent planting, designed into the soft landscaping strategy, ensuring that the height of the hop-over builds gradually to encourage bats to fly up and over the A303. In addition to this, a dense shrub layer should be planted along the verge to discourage bats from crossing the road low down, forcing them up and over the road, away from traffic. The presence of bat species known to fly through vegetation such as brown long-eared bat, greater horseshoe bat, lesser horseshoe bat, means that wooden screen/mesh is also recommended to be installed alongside the dense shrub.</p>
40.12 e	<p>The ecologist welcomes further dialogue to fully understand the various assessments of species and the extent and nature of the proposed mitigation, enhancement and monitoring and the mechanisms for securing it. Further survey work will be required prior to construction and the ecologist welcomes input.</p>	<p>Dialogue with the South Somerset District Council's Ecologist will continue.</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
40.13	<p>Impact on People and Communities</p> <p>Only light touch proposals regarding construction methodology and traffic management have been submitted to date. The Councils will therefore look to ensure that a mechanism is included within the wording of the DCO to secure an approved construction traffic management plan.</p> <p>The Council has previously raised concerns over the absence of an approved signage strategy and potential implications of less direct access to Fleet Air Arm Museum and RNAS Yeovilton. The impact of the design of Hazelgrove Junction upon the viability of local businesses is also of concern and should be mitigated where possible.</p> <p>The defined Local Impact Area for businesses is restrictive and does not allow impacts on various route-reliant businesses and visitor attractions to be taken into account. A number of small businesses and tourist attractions such as Haynes International Motor Museum, Hadspen House (Emily Estate to open spring 2019), Hauser and Wirth and Fleet Air Arm Museum are outside this tightly drawn area. Consideration should be given of the impact on the wider business community.</p> <p>The effective management of traffic and good signage, especially during the construction phase of the proposed route will be essential, to ensure that businesses and communities are not negatively impacted. Funding to promote these businesses during the construction phase where it may be more difficult to access the facilities is necessary. The message should be clear that "South Somerset is still open for business".</p> <p>Road closures are included within outline proposals. However, only outline details have been received to date. Whilst it is suggested that the majority of closures be overnight, the potential impacts on residents and the business community will need to be considered. This further reinforces the need to ensure that there is appropriate provision within the DCO drafting to include a commitment for detailed measures to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority, especially given that Yeovil Refresh includes highways improvements that may come forward during the construction period.</p>	<p>Chapter 12 People and Communities of the Environmental Statement (APP-049) includes an assessment on community facilities and the local economy. For these aspects, the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11 Section 3 Parts 6 and 9 and considers both direct and indirect effects arising as a result of the construction and operation of the scheme. The assessment identifies social and community resources in the study area, as well as receptors relevant to the topic, and identifies the activities relating to the scheme that could have an effect on those receptors and resources.</p> <p>For the local economy, Slight Beneficial effects are anticipated during construction, due to the addition of new construction jobs locally and workforce using local facilities. Once operational, there are likely to be increased indirect employment opportunities related to reduced congestion and improved journey times, with a Slight Beneficial effect anticipated.</p>
40.14	<p>Geology, Assets and Waste</p> <p>The Councils are satisfied with the approach, assessment methodology, identified likely effects and proposed mitigation measures presented by the developer in the documents reviewed. We do, however, have a number of observations on the baseline data presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement and the proposed Site Waste Management Plan which link to waste generation in Somerset; latest data for landfill capacity in Somerset, including inert landfill; and, the operational status of Somerset waste sites, but we do not consider these affect the overall outcome of the assessment. Detail relating to these points will be further outlined within the Local Impact Report and Statement of Common Ground.</p>	<p>Somerset County Council have been contacted via email on Monday 12 November 2018 to provide updated data in relation to landfill capacity in Somerset, including inert landfill, and the operational status of Somerset waste sites. The Applicant agrees with the Council's conclusions that the updated baseline data is not likely to affect the overall outcome of the Materials assessment presented within Chapter 10 Materials of the Environmental Statement (APP-047), but this will be reviewed on receipt of the updated baseline data.</p>
40.15	<p>Lead Local Flood Authority</p> <p>It is assumed that all the relevant CCTV surveys of drainage assets, as detailed in the DCO, have been undertaken as well as condition and extent surveys. It is understood that the ground investigations were being undertaken at the time of writing the Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategies, but these should be used to inform the strategies. There will be a need to provide more detail of the various drainage features, ponds and structures as the proposals progress, including cross sections, levels and structures. These details should include any temporary or phased arrangements necessary for the construction of the scheme; including how and when these will be brought forward and become operational.</p>	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6 of the Environmental Statement, APP-059) and Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 4.7 of the Drainage Strategy Report, APP-060) have been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement, in the absence of Ground Investigation (GI) data. Following receipt of this data, this will be analysed and the reports updated accordingly, to be used to inform the detailed design of the scheme.</p>
40.16	<p>Conclusions</p> <p>It is hoped that the comments above are helpful to the Examining Authority in informing their initial assessment of principal issues for examination. As outlined above, the continued review of the application material will enable the Councils to provide greater detail and explanation in their Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
RR-041	South Somerset District Council	
41.1	<p>The proposed dualling of the A303 between Sparkford and Ilchester is within the administrative boundaries of South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council and therefore the 'Councils' are host authorities and statutory consultees in the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme
Comments on Relevant Representations

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
41.2	This relevant representation reiterates the Councils' support for the dualling scheme. However, the Councils wish to ensure that the development does not result in unacceptable impacts on the residents, businesses and environment of the affected local area. We have therefore taken the opportunity to highlight issues that should be considered by the Planning Inspectorate at the Examination.	Noted.
41.3	The Councils note that the scheme submitted is still only at preliminary design stage, and whilst advanced, is not finalised. On this basis, further localised impacts or issues may emerge and these will be presented to the Examining Authority as further information comes forward. There therefore continues to be a considerable volume of work that remains to be done and it is essential that the Councils have adequate resources provided to perform their functions. The Councils are disappointed that negotiations for a Planning Performance Agreement were unsuccessful which has limited their capacity and ability to fully assess the submitted DCO within the timeframes available. A detailed assessment of the scheme by the Councils is therefore ongoing. The Councils also have concerns in the context of having a fair chance to put their case and ensuring an adequate examination of the issues.	Noted.
41.4	The comments listed below are intended as a summary, which will be further developed and detailed within the emerging Written Representations, Local Impact Report and Statements of Common Ground.	Noted.
41.5	Impact on the Local Highway Network The Councils have previously advised the applicant during the pre-application stage that a Transport Assessment should be prepared to confirm that the proposed layout is appropriate in traffic terms. It is understood that this has not been prepared but the applicant has prepared and submitted a CoMMA Report and Transport Report which includes technical modelling data.	Noted.
41.6	Review of the modelling data has shown that the scheme is likely to increase traffic through the communities of West Camel and Sparkford. Whilst this is understood from review of the technical data, it is unclear why the impacts on these local areas, which could be more wide-ranging than just increased traffic and include for example impact on cultural heritage or ecology, are not described in detail within the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapters and we consider that there may be residual impacts which may need to be mitigated. We note that communities have raised concerns about increased traffic and we understand that the applicant is willing to make funds available to address this in West Camel; Sparkford is still being considered. Traffic calming measures and other mitigation measures should therefore be explored and considered through the DCO process with any additional impacts of this considered, and a mechanism established to secure this mitigation.	Changes to traffic movements from the scheme which have the potential to impact on the setting of heritage assets have been assessed as part of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043). During both construction and operation, there are not anticipated to be any significant adverse effects on cultural heritage within the communities of West Camel or Sparkford associated with traffic. Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044) has assessed the construction and operational effects to the Conservation Areas (of which West Camel is designated as one); no significant adverse effects are anticipated during either construction or operation. A Statement of Common Ground is being pursued with South Somerset District Council which includes an element in relation to traffic.
41.7	The Local Impact Area does not appear to include the locations of West Camel, Queen Camel or Podimore Roundabout. We originally recommended to Highways England that a "wider sphere of influence may be required to capture the wider scheme impacts....." it would appear that this hasn't been taken into account and therefore it appears that a significant amount of scheme impact has not been included within the report.	
41.8	In addition, the CoMMA report includes operational traffic assessments of the proposed junctions but the assessment has shown potential issues around the junction of Sparkford High Street - The Avenue and Podimore Roundabout. In the absence of an explanation of these issues as part of the ES it is suggested that the applicant provides their view on the impacts and comment on whether the impact warrants appropriate mitigation.	
41.9	SCC as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been working with the applicant's designer since January 2018, providing comments on technical submissions related to new local road provision; provision for non-motorised users; signage and road markings; structures; construction proposals; drainage; and street lighting. In addition, matters relating to maintenance provision and extents of responsibility; regulatory measures on local roads; and de-trunking works have also been discussed, but again are at an early stage of agreement.	Noted.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
41.10	The technical elements do still require agreement through developed detailed design; however it is noted that the detailed designs are not yet programmed to be progressed until appointment of a further designer and potentially after conclusion of the examination. SCC considers that the outstanding issues are capable of being resolved, however, SCC will require provision within the wording of the DCO for the LHA to approve the remaining detailed design elements and agreement for the associated fees associated with this. At present it is considered that such a commitment is not yet contained within the DCO.	This is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and as such the approving authority is the Secretary of State (SoS). It would not be possible, under these arrangements, for the Local Highway Authority also to have approving powers, although the SoS will require evidence of consultation with the Local Highway Authority. This is provided within Article 12 of the draft DCO (APP-017).
41.11	For those sections which fall to the responsibility of the LHA under DCO de-trunking procedures, it is normal practice for the LHA to be compensated by Highways England for the additional maintenance burden the roads will present to the Council. The compensatory arrangements have not yet been agreed including the end uses of all redundant sections of the A303 route.	The sections of existing A303 to be de-trunked have been agreed with the Local Highway Authority and are contained in the De-trunking Works Plans (APP-015). However, the minimum hand-over condition has not been agreed, and the existing condition of the asset has not been established. Until these and subsequent actions have been addressed it is not possible to agree the resulting compensatory arrangements. Discussions are ongoing, and a timeline for these aspects has been proposed for the consideration of the Local Highway Authority.
41.12 A	Public Rights of Way The information in the various documents and Draft DCO where shown in detail, is generally an accurate portrayal of the recorded public rights of way. Some of the more schematic figures of the whole application area would appear to have minor errors, but not sufficient to be of concern. The LHA does have some concerns in relation to the methodology for assessing the usage of the network; by not covering full daylight hours, nor weekend days, the results of non-motorised user surveys is not considered entirely representative of the actual use.	The survey methodology and results are summarised in Appendix 12.1 of the Environmental Statement (APP-093). This document explains that two sets of surveys were conducted in 2016. One survey was undertaken during the summer holiday period (albeit on weekdays) and one survey was undertaken during term time in September (again, during weekdays). The objective of the surveys was to capture a snap-shot of the overall level of usage of rights of way, and in this respect the results have proved useful. The surveys highlighted a selection of relatively well used rights of way within an area that is otherwise lightly used. It is not considered that results during daylight evenings or weekends on this relatively lightly trafficked network would have provided a significantly different conclusion, given that the surveys were undertaken in good weather and during school holidays.
41.12 B	Public Rights of Way In general the analysis of the impact of the development is a fair portrayal with one particular exception in relation to public bridleway Y 30/28. The LHA has concerns in relation to the impact of the stopping up of the connection of Y30/28 with the A303. The current proposal from the applicant is provision of a route east to the nearest new vehicular overbridge. The applicant, in line with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, is expected to take appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse effects on public rights of way. The LHA considers that the proposed mitigation, whilst beneficial to the overall network is not the most appropriate. The length of the alternative route proposed by the applicant is c.5.2km for walkers, cyclists and equestrians. If instead the alternative was over Y 30/UN (now labelled Y 30/31), this length would be reduced to c.1.5km. This is a considerable difference in length and convenience.	Highways England agree with the Local Highway Authority that the published scheme is beneficial to the overall network.
41.12 C	Public Rights of Way In addition to the recorded network of Public Rights of Way, there are potentially unrecorded rights that may exist which the development will interfere with. Given the potential impact of the scheme it is considered that the possible outcomes of current applications to modify the Definitive Map and Statement would necessitate a mechanism to be included within the DCO which safeguards the provision of such rights in the future if and when they are confirmed.	At the time of the submission of the draft DCO, the Applicant were aware of one such application for a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) that was relevant to this scheme. This was Modification No 859. The published scheme accommodates this potential modification. It will be necessary for Somerset County Council to advise the Examining Authority which additional DMMO applications it has received, and for the examination process to consider if these can be accommodated within the scheme.
41.13	Impact on Air Quality Having reviewed all the information provided with this application, we are satisfied that the baseline information and assessment methods used in respect of air quality modelling is satisfactory. Whilst there appears to be no significant changes to air quality from the proposed scheme itself and as such, no mitigation measures have been proposed, there are two areas of concern to the Council, West Camel and Sparkford High Street where it is predicted the scheme will result in significantly increased traffic movements which may have an adverse effect on air quality. Further investigation is needed to ensure these areas will not exceed air quality limits and to determine whether appropriate mitigation measures are necessary.	Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement (APP-042) outlines the assessment undertaken to assess the air quality impact during operation of the scheme at worst affected receptors. This includes consideration of the impact at Hazel Grove Lodge on Sparkford High Street. The assessment concludes that concentrations of PM ₁₀ and NO ₂ at these human health receptors are expected to be well below the respective air quality objectives. The predicted effects from the operation of the scheme on local air quality are therefore concluded to be not significant so no mitigation measures are proposed. The impact at receptors in West Camel is not significant because the predicted change in traffic flows through West Camel on Fore Street is below the criteria for assessment, as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance. Nonetheless, "The Hollies" on Plowage Lane which is located adjacent to the existing A303 has been modelled. This receptor is predicted to experience an improvement in air quality as a result of the scheme due to the change in alignment of the A303 (the A303 moves further away from the receptor).

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
41.14	<p>Impact on Noise and Vibration Having reviewed the information provided, we are satisfied that the baseline information in respect of noise and vibration is satisfactory, the assessment methods used are appropriate and the presentation of the results clearly demonstrate the likely effects the proposed scheme will have during construction and when in operation.</p> <p>It is expected and understood that Best Practice Measures will be implemented during construction to mitigate the adverse effects of noise and vibration. Approval is to be obtained from the District Council through the Section 61 process which will ensure any mitigation identified will have no residual significant impacts. It is noted that there are 2 properties that will be significantly affected by operational noise once the scheme is open to traffic, however, the mitigation embedded in the scheme design and secondary double glazing for the 2 properties will be sufficient to mitigate the effects of the operational noise.</p> <p>We however have concerns about the proposed scheme causing significant increases in traffic on Sparkford High Street and West Camel and the subsequent increase in noise as a result of this.</p>	<p>On the particular issue of the Sparkford Community - the noise increase of up to 1.3dB (paragraph 11.10.61 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement, APP-048) is due to increased traffic on Sparkford High Street. This is because the scheme will reduce journey times between Sparkford and Ilchester making the route via the High Street more attractive to vehicles travelling from Frome to destinations south-west of Ilchester and vice-versa. It is expected that some traffic that currently uses the A361 and A37 for this route would divert to using the A361, A359 and A303 so increasing the traffic along Sparkford High Street.</p>
41.15	<p>Impact on Cultural Heritage The scheme is within an area of high historic and cultural value and whilst the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which is the accepted methodology for infrastructure projects, and sets out a logical sequence for assessment and review, the assessment for some assets is queried.</p> <p>The increased traffic in West Camel and Sparkford may require mitigation. Any traffic calming measures that are required as a direct outcome of the dualling works should be included in the DCO and their effects on Conservation Areas and associated cultural heritage assessed. Such measures should assess the impact on the character and appearance of a conservation area or setting of a listed building and impact of traffic-induced vibration on the structural integrity of historic buildings and structures. Given that the traffic modelling for the scheme indicates an increase in HGV traffic as a direct outcome of the dualling works, it is recommended that traffic-induced vibration on historic buildings and structures, and increased traffic loads on Camel Bridge are assessed.</p> <p>Whilst mitigation measures are outlined with the application, additional mitigation is required, details of which will be outlined in the Written Representations and Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>The impact on the character and appearance of a conservation area or setting of a listed building of historic buildings and structures has been assessed as part of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-046). During construction, there are not anticipated to be any significant adverse effects to Conservation Areas or Listed Buildings as a result of increases in local traffic in West Camel and Sparkford, as outlined in Table 6.4 Significant Construction Effects of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-046). Once operational, there are not anticipated to be any significant adverse effects to Conservation Areas or Listed Buildings as a result of increases in local traffic, as outlined within Table 6.5 Significant Operational Effects of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-046).</p>
41.16	<p>Impact on Archaeology The data does not currently include the full suite of field investigations required to assess the significance or impacts of heritage assets. The applicant has carried out a geophysical survey of the scheme and is currently engaged in trial trenching. The applicant's archaeological consultants have been in contact with the South West Heritage Trust (SWHT) and Written Schemes of Investigation for the survey and trial trenching have been agreed. The geophysical survey has indicated archaeological potential across areas of the scheme. The SWHT is engaged in monitoring of the trial trenching (in conjunction with HE where appropriate) and this is progressing well.</p> <p>It is understood that the results of the fieldwork will be submitted during the application process and so it is envisaged that all required information will be available prior to any determination.</p> <p>The documents that have been submitted are accepted as meeting the requirements of the initial phase of the assessment. The later submission of the geophysical survey and trial trenching will enable a mitigation strategy to be designed. At present it is not possible to comment fully on the ES Chapter and issues associated with the impacts on archaeology.</p>	<p>As detailed within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043), the results of the archaeological investigations will be submitted as other environmental information to support the Development Consent Order (DCO) application during the examination period. The results will help to develop specific mitigation measures to be detailed within a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which will be prepared during Detailed Design and is a requirement of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (APP-148).</p>

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
41.17	<p>Impact on Landscape</p> <p>The methodology for establishing the landscape and visual baseline in the ES is comprehensive and clearly sets out the study area, designated sites, landscape character and its sensitivity to change, and the visual baseline and its sensitivity to change. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the DMRB, Interim Advice Note 135/10 Landscape and Visual Effects Assessments (replacing parts of the DMRB) and the Landscape Institute Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessments. The DMRB is the accepted methodology for infrastructure projects and the Landscape Institute guidance is a long-established industry tool.</p> <p>The assessment for the likely effects is challenged for a number of visual receptors and requires reassessment. A number of measures and additional information are recommended to the landscape design to improve the impact on the scheme on the landscape its appreciation from visual receptors. These will be detailed in the Written Representations and Local Impact Report.</p>	Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044) has been produced to report the likely effects on landscape and visual as a result of the scheme, during both construction and operation. The landscape design has been developed as part of an iterative design development process, and the mitigation will be reviewed during the detailed design stage.
41.18 a	<p>Impact on Biodiversity</p> <p>The information presented is generally accurate but there are some omissions and these have been raised at Highways England Technical Working Groups and officers are working to progress matters. Any outstanding matters will be raised in the Local Impact Report.</p>	Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (APP-045) has been produced to report the likely effects on biodiversity as a result of the scheme, during both construction and operation. Questions raised by the County Ecologist are being addressed as part of the ongoing Environmental Technical Working Group (TWG).
41.18 b	Approximately 91 hectares of habitat clearance would be undertaken as part of the proposed scheme, 77.4 hectares would be temporarily damaged and 13.7 hectares permanently removed. Whilst overall it is suggested that there would be a net gain in biodiversity, this is unclear and requires evidencing using the use of metrics.	It has been agreed with Natural England that the use of the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) metric is not appropriate for this scheme.
41.18 c	The loss of hedgerows and woodland is concerning. The replanting and replacement of mature trees on a 1 for 1 basis is insufficient and new planting should be on a 3 for 1 basis which would allow for natural losses. An appropriate ecological management plan will need to be in place to ensure that all the re-created habitats are managed to the intended habitat and for the duration of the scheme.	The largest block of woodland to be lost (1.33 hectares) is south of Hazlegrove House. This woodland is poorly structured with limited understory and a species composition not indicative of ancient woodland. Other small areas of broadleaved semi-natural woodland and plantation woodland will be lost but the structure/ species composition did not indicate ancient woodland. There will be a substantial net gain of woodland habitat as a result of the scheme. There is a net loss of hedgerow of 91.91 metres. However, hedgerow to be lost includes some defunct and species poor hedgerows. Habitat planting will comprise species rich hedgerows.
41.18 d	Of particular concern is the hedgerow east of Canegore Corner, no mitigation measures are proposed to counteract the effect of the proposed road construction on bats or other species, or for proposed species crossing the new A303 once operational. It is recommended that a "green bridge" be considered here and underpasses elsewhere as the opportunity exits.	We are proposing a bat hop-over at this location. Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (APP-045) states that this hop-over will be formed of more permanent planting, designed into the soft landscaping strategy, ensuring that the height of the hop-over builds gradually to encourage bats to fly up and over the A303. In addition to this, a dense shrub layer should be planted along the verge to discourage bats from crossing the road low down, forcing them up and over the road, away from traffic. The presence of bat species known to fly through vegetation such as brown long-eared bat, greater horseshoe bat, lesser horseshoe bat, means that wooden screen/mesh is also recommended to be installed alongside the dense shrub.
41.18 e	The ecologist welcomes further dialogue to fully understand the various assessments of species and the extent and nature of the proposed mitigation, enhancement and monitoring and the mechanisms for securing it. Further survey work will be required prior to construction and the ecologist welcomes input.	Dialogue with the South Somerset District Council Ecologist will continue.

Reference number	Comment from Relevant Representation	Response to Relevant Representation
41.19	<p>Impact on People and Communities</p> <p>Only light touch proposals regarding construction methodology and traffic management have been submitted to date. The Councils will therefore look to ensure that a mechanism is included within the wording of the DCO to secure an approved construction traffic management plan.</p> <p>The Council has previously raised concerns over the absence of an approved signage strategy and potential implications of less direct access to Fleet Air Arm Museum and RNAS Yeovilton. The impact of the design of Hazelgrove Junction upon the viability of local businesses is also of concern and should be mitigated where possible.</p> <p>The defined Local Impact Area for businesses is restrictive and does not allow impacts on various route-reliant businesses and visitor attractions to be taken into account. A number of small businesses and tourist attractions such as Haynes International Motor Museum, Hadspen House (Emily Estate to open spring 2019), Hauser and Wirth and Fleet Air Arm Museum are outside this tightly drawn area. Consideration should be given of the impact on the wider business community.</p> <p>The effective management of traffic and good signage, especially during the construction phase of the proposed route will be essential, to ensure that businesses and communities are not negatively impacted. Funding to promote these businesses during the construction phase where it may be more difficult to access the facilities is necessary. The message should be clear that "South Somerset is still open for business".</p> <p>Road closures are included within outline proposals. However, only outline details have been received to date. Whilst it is suggested that the majority of closures be overnight, the potential impacts on residents and the business community will need to be considered. This further reinforces the need to ensure that there is appropriate provision within the DCO drafting to include a commitment for detailed measures to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority, especially given that Yeovil Refresh includes highways improvements that may come forward during the construction period.</p>	<p>Chapter 12 People and Communities of the Environmental Statement (APP-049) includes an assessment on community facilities and the local economy. For these aspects, the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11 Section 3 Parts 6 and 9 and considers both direct and indirect effects arising as a result of the construction and operation of the scheme. The assessment identifies social and community resources in the study area, as well as receptors relevant to the topic, and identifies the activities relating to the scheme that could have an effect on those receptors and resources.</p> <p>For the local economy, Slight Beneficial effects are anticipated during construction, due to the addition of new construction jobs locally and workforce using local facilities. Once operational, there are likely to be increased indirect employment opportunities related to reduced congestion and improved journey times, with a Slight Beneficial effect anticipated.</p>
41.20	<p>Geology, Assets and Waste</p> <p>The Councils are satisfied with the approach, assessment methodology, identified likely effects and proposed mitigation measures presented by the developer in the documents reviewed. We do, however, have a number of observations on the baseline data presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement and the proposed Site Waste Management Plan which link to waste generation in Somerset; latest data for landfill capacity in Somerset, including inert landfill; and, the operational status of Somerset waste sites, but we do not consider these affect the overall outcome of the assessment. Detail relating to these points will be further outlined within the Local Impact Report and Statement of Common Ground.</p>	<p>Somerset County Council have been contacted via email on Monday 12 November 2018 to provide updated data in relation to landfill capacity in Somerset, including inert landfill, and the operational status of Somerset waste sites. We agree with the Council's conclusions that the updated baseline data is not likely to affect the overall outcome of the Materials assessment presented within Chapter 10 Materials of the Environmental Statement (APP-047), but this will be reviewed on receipt of the updated baseline data.</p>
41.21	<p>Lead Local Flood Authority</p> <p>It is assumed that all the relevant CCTV surveys of drainage assets, as detailed in the DCO, have been undertaken as well as condition and extent surveys. It is understood that the ground investigations were being undertaken at the time of writing the Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategies, but these should be used to inform the strategies. There will be a need to provide more detail of the various drainage features, ponds and structures as the proposals progress, including cross sections, levels and structures. These details should include any temporary or phased arrangements necessary for the construction of the scheme; including how and when these will be brought forward and become operational.</p>	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6 of the Environmental Statement, APP-059) and Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 4.7 of the Drainage Strategy Report, APP-060) have been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement, in the absence of Ground Investigation (GI) data. Following receipt of this data, this will be analysed and the reports updated accordingly, to be used to inform the detailed design of the scheme.</p>
41.22	<p>Conclusions</p> <p>It is hoped that the comments above are helpful to the Examining Authority in informing their initial assessment of principal issues for examination. As outlined above, the continued review of the application material will enable the Councils to provide greater detail and explanation in their Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>