

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme TR010036

8.18 Statement of Common Ground with Alan and Mr and Mrs Walton, Long Hazel Park

APFP Regulation 5(2)(g)
Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
April 2018



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]

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010036
Application Document Reference	8.18
Author:	A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	January 2019	First draft
Rev 1	March 2019	Issued for Deadline 4

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Mr and Mrs Walton, Long Hazel Park

Signed.....
[NAME]
[ROLE]
on behalf of Highways England
Date: [DATE]

Signed.....
[NAME]
[ROLE]
Long Hazel Park
Date: [DATE]

DRAFT

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose of this document.....	3
1.2	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground.....	3
1.3	Terminology	3
1.4	Record of Engagement	4
2.	Issues.....	7

DRAFT

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared in respect of the proposed A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling ("the Application") made by Highways England Company Limited ("Highways England") to the Secretary of State for Transport ("Secretary of State") for a Development Consent Order ("the Order") under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and / or the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.3 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Highways England as the Applicant and (2) Mr and Mrs Walton, Long Hazel Park.
- 1.2.2 Highways England became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England.
- 1.2.3 Mr and Mrs Walton own Long Hazel Park, located off the A359 Sparkford High Street, which is to the east of the proposed A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling scheme. 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 South Somerset District Council.

1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the tables in the Issues chapter of this SoCG, "Not Agreed" indicates a final position, and "Under discussion" where these points will be the subject of on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties. "Agreed" indicates where the issue has been resolved.
- 1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to Mr and Mrs Walton, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either

not of material interest or relevance to Mr and Mrs Walton.

1.4 Record of Engagement

1.4.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and Mr and Mrs Walton in relation to the Application is outlined in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Record of engagement between Highways England and Mr and Mrs Walton

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the issues tables)
16/02/2018	Email	Email sent to Tom Roberts to explain their objections to scheme taking any of their land for use. Supporting documents have been supplied for this. These include planning permissions, traffic noise reports, sewage and utilities plans.
16/02/2018	Email	Email sent from Alex Murphy in response to the email sent to Tom Roberts on 16/02/2018. Alex stated that although the red line boundary slightly encroaches the Walton's land, the scheme does not envisage that any land acquisition will be required and the red line boundary will be updated to reflect this. He stated that the red line boundary will not be fixed until the summer of 2018.
19/05/2018	Email	Email from Alan and Pamela Walton passing on five comments regarding the scheme and their land. 1) Clarification of the western boundary which extends out to the fence line with Long Hazel Farm. 2) A request for an explanation of the small rectangular box shown within the red line boundary to the north west corner of ST103525. 3) A request for the boundary of Long Hazel Dairy Farm to be considered for a noise mitigation barrier. 4) Will any elevated sections of the new road have noise reduction barriers? 5) Will the tourism direction signage be preserved and accounted for?
07/06/18	Email	Email received from Mr and Mrs Walton, questioning whether the expected levels of noise will be greater once the scheme is complete. They then ask further questions regarding the anticipated decibel level of traffic noise at their boundary at present and what is it projected to be. As well as if they will get a noise reduction fence on our boundary. Mr and Mrs Walton questioned when the public enquiry is likely to be and can their email be included in the papers to go before the Planning Inspectorate.
26/06/2018	Email	Response from Alex Murphy providing Mr and Mrs Walton with the noise levels they requested, which indicates an increase. Mr Murphy explained the receptor location on the site does not trigger the criteria for significant adverse effect due to noise, and therefore no new mitigation proposed along the boundary. The email informs Mr and Mrs Walton of the new planning process known as the Development Consent Order (DCO) which allows stakeholders to make a representation in front of the Planning Inspectorate.
27/06/2018	Email	Mr and Mrs Walton responded informing of the adverse effect an increase in noise could have on their business. For the remainder of their lodges to be approved for development, noise levels need to be 35 decibels or less. For this reason they are requesting that the Planning Inspector will consider it appropriate to order that Highways England do make necessary adjustments to mitigate this traffic noise or to pay such compensation.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the issues tables)
27/06/2018	Email	Alex Murphy informed Mr and Mrs Walton that it is too early to provide dates of hearings and when representations can be made, advertisements will be made nearer the time.
02/10/2018	Email	Mr and Mrs Walton have engaged with Mr Tegwyn Jones (Traffic Noise Planning Consultant) to advise on the traffic noise impact on their approved residential lodge development. Mr Jones has requested the raw data on which the prediction is modelled. They also requested more detail on noise measurements on their boundary. It is envisaged that Mr Jones will prepare a report.
02/10/2018	Email	Alex Murphy questioned whether it would be possible for our noise team to contact Mr Jones directly to understand exactly what he would like from us.
03/10/2018	Email	Email from Tegwyn Jones, who is advising Alan Walton on traffic noise impact. Ms Jones requested the parameters on which the prediction of traffic noise is modelled.
04/10/2018	Email	Alex Murphy responded to Tegwyn Jones' email, confirming he is looking into the request and will respond as soon as possible.
15/10/2018	Email	Alex Murphy provided a response to Tegwyn Jones following an email received 3 October 2018. Alex provided the parameters used in predicting traffic noise at Long Hazel Park, including how gradients were calculated and road surface corrections. Alex notes that the assessment calculated distances to receivers based on AddressBase data points and not to property/land boundaries. Having used the model to estimate horizontal distances to the nearest Long Hazel Park boundary (dm), Alex provided a table showing old and new distances.
11/12/2018	Email	Alan and Pamela Walton emailed Alex Murphy and PINS, attaching their explanatory statement, an aerial plan of our property and plans Annex 2 and Annex 3 showing the amenity areas exposed to traffic noise. The Annex Plan 2 relates to now plus during construction and after completion which will be morphed into the green area shown on Annex 3 depending on how quickly we can redevelop the site.
13/12/2018	Email	Alex Murphy emailed Mr Walton thanking him for attending the open floor hearing on the 12 December 2018. Alex asked if Mr Walton would be free on the 16th January 2018 for a visit from him and a member of the noise team to allow them to explain the noise modelling process in more detail and how we have reached the conclusions we have. The meeting would be of a technical nature, so we would not be in a position to discuss compensation.
15/12/2018	Email	Alan Walton responded to Alex Murphy stating, I am pleased and relieved that I did attend the meeting on Wednesday otherwise I would not have been able to respond to your Solicitor's application for the Direction for a Statement of Common Ground as it relates to our position to be quashed. Your Solicitor also gave the room the impression in his address that there was not going to be any agreement regarding us and he did not seem at all happy in having to spend time preparing Statements of Common Ground with either ourselves or Sparkford Hall. The Learned Planning Inspectors did indicate that they would deliberate and issue a written ruling shortly. We have instructed Mr Tegwyn Jones to deal with technical issues and we believe Sparkford Hall has also consulted with him and Counsel. We would not wish to enter into any matters relating to our concerns outside of the examination process. Having put forward our position and having addressed all the points raised by the Planning Inspectorate in our email dated 11 December 2018 we consider it reasonable to await the

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes (the topics should align with the issues tables)
		<p>Learned Inspectors' written ruling. Depending on the outcome, we will either await hearing from your Solicitor with draft Statement of Common Ground for approval or if the Learned Inspectors rule that a Statement of Common Ground is no longer required we will put our position comprehensively during the examination process. As others in the locality of Sparkford have concerns about traffic noise we hope these representations can be programmed together during the examination process. We appreciate that you are not in a position to discuss compensation at this state but this was one of the points raised in the Directive and that is why we touched upon this subject. For reasons stated above we would not wish to participate in the visit as suggested. However, we will be asking to attend any site meeting to be held later by the Learned Inspectors.</p>
17/12/2018	Email	<p>Alex Murphy thanked Mr Walton for his email, dated 15 December 2018. Alex informs Mr Walton, if he changes his mind regarding a visit, to please let him know and he will arrange a convenient time.</p>
28/12/2018	Email	<p>Alex Murphy emailed Mr Walton a link to the Rule 8 letter, issued by PINS. Within this letter, PINS has asked the team commence the drafting of a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with Mr and Mrs Walton. Alex asks Mr Walton if he would re-consider a visit, so his concerns can be discussed in relation to noise and those comments can be captured in the SoCG.</p>
	Visit	<p>Alex Murphy, Stuart Dyne and James Mackenzie visited Mr Walton and walked around the caravan park. Mr Walton explained his concerns about noise from the A303 and demonstrated the mitigation that he has introduced around the site.</p>

1.4.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) Highways England and (2) Mr and Mrs Walton, Long Hazel Park in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

2. Issues

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status
General – Need for the scheme	Provided the traffic noise issues can be addressed which in turn will benefit the local community from tourism spending because this is generated considerably by the accommodation providers of Long Hazel Park and Sparkford Hall, the Scheme is supported.	Highways England is pleased that Mr & Mrs Walton support the scheme. Mr and Mrs Walton's concerns about noise are discussed below.	AGREED
General – Proposed Hazlegrove Junction Layout	Proposed Layout of Hazlegrove Roundabout is supported subject to traffic noise issues being addressed.	Highways England is pleased that Mr & Mrs Walton support the proposed layout of the junction. Mr and Mrs Walton's concerns about noise are discussed below.	AGREED
General – Low Noise Surfacing on main line	It is noted that any new surfacing will not extend beyond the new work. The Learned Inspector is urged to explore the possibility of extending this surfacing to mitigate traffic noise for us, our neighbours and the Village.	Low noise surfacing is proposed throughout the scheme and is likely to extend approximately 500m east of the existing Hazlegrove Roundabout, but no further. The existing eastbound carriageway of the A303 next to the Caravan Park is already a low noise surface but the westbound carriageway is conventional hot rolled asphalt.	NOT AGREED
Traffic Calming in Sparkford	We would like the scheme to provide a traffic calming solution for Sparkford Highstreet, which could also include reduced noise surfacing and a pedestrian crossing.	Highways England considers that traffic calming is not required on Sparkford Highstreet.	NOT AGREED

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status
Existing condition - Noise	In relation to amenity areas all lodges have an immediate outside space and the worst affected by traffic noise will be in the current lodge development area – Phase 1 now being marketed. Already with about 100 enquiries, most viewings have ended with potential customers being put off by excessive traffic noise from the A303.	It is noted that the existing noise environment at Long Hazel Park is putting off potential customers.	AGREED
Existing condition - Noise	A number of visitors are put off returning to the site due to the existing traffic noise. We have issued Highways England with a number of reviews from guests stating how they liked the site, but have been put off returning due to the existing traffic noise.	It is noted that the existing noise environment at Long Hazel Park is putting off potential customers and we can confirm we have read some of the visitor reviews that confirm the existing noise is a significant issue.	AGREED
Noise modelling methodology	We still strongly feel that for Highways England to rely on the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges to claim that increases in traffic noise levels for the Scheme will be insignificant is unacceptable.	The Calculation of Road Traffic Noise Methodology prescribed by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges is the standard approach for the calculation of road traffic noise. In turn DMRB specifies criteria for the classification of noise impact in the short-term and the long-term by reference to changes in the calculated noise levels. These calculations show that the impact at the locations of the proposed lodges in Long Hazel Park is negligible or minor. Using the criteria set out on the ES the impact of the scheme is not significant.	NOT AGREED
Noise monitoring methodology	We commission our own noise surveys as described below:	The noise levels made by Tegwyn Jones on 24 Aug 16 (REP2-042) may be compared with model predictions at the same locations. In this context it is noted that Mr Jones has not	AGREED

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status																																												
	<p>Attended monitoring exercise was carried out at 11 locations, between 9.30am and 12pm on 24th August 2016, during a period of peak traffic flow on the A303. The weather conditions were calm and dry, and there was no extraneous noise. Each measurement was made 1.5m above ground level.</p> <p>We would be interested to compare the Applicant's model with our own model.</p>	<p>specified the entity involved in the measurements which are all relatively short-term and carried out between 9:30am and midday. The measured values are therefore compared with the predicted DM free-field daytime LAeq for the period 7am to 7pm and derived from the model prediction of LA10,18h using the TRL method 3 formula $L_{day} = 0.95 \times LA_{10,18h} + 1.44 \text{dB}$. The results are set out below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>TJ location</th> <th>Aggregated [dB]</th> <th>Predicted Lday [dB]</th> <th>difference [dB]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1</td><td>60.9</td><td>57.3</td><td>3.6</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>60.4</td><td>57.8</td><td>2.6</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>58.5</td><td>57.6</td><td>0.9</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>52.9</td><td>55.9</td><td>-3.0</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>57.7</td><td>55.6</td><td>2.1</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>51.5</td><td>54.0</td><td>-2.5</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>51.3</td><td>53.9</td><td>-2.6</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>55.9</td><td>53.7</td><td>2.2</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>53.0</td><td>54.8</td><td>-1.8</td></tr> <tr><td>average</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.2</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The measurements from Mr Jones are shown in the column labelled 'Aggregated'. The predicted Lday at the same location is shown in the next column and the final column shows the difference as positive when the predicted value is lower than the measured value. The</p>	TJ location	Aggregated [dB]	Predicted Lday [dB]	difference [dB]	1	60.9	57.3	3.6	4	60.4	57.8	2.6	5	58.5	57.6	0.9	6	52.9	55.9	-3.0	7	57.7	55.6	2.1	8	51.5	54.0	-2.5	9	51.3	53.9	-2.6	10	55.9	53.7	2.2	11	53.0	54.8	-1.8	average			0.2	
TJ location	Aggregated [dB]	Predicted Lday [dB]	difference [dB]																																												
1	60.9	57.3	3.6																																												
4	60.4	57.8	2.6																																												
5	58.5	57.6	0.9																																												
6	52.9	55.9	-3.0																																												
7	57.7	55.6	2.1																																												
8	51.5	54.0	-2.5																																												
9	51.3	53.9	-2.6																																												
10	55.9	53.7	2.2																																												
11	53.0	54.8	-1.8																																												
average			0.2																																												

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status
		<p>average value of the difference is 0.2dB and all but one of the measurements is within 3dB of the predicted value. Given the very short-term nature of the measurements and that predicted values are based on annual average figures, the similarity is striking. Both predictions and measurements show that noise falls with distance from the A303.</p> <p>The measurements do not therefore represent a basis for rejection of the Applicant's model as they appear to show reasonable consistency with the model.</p>	
Noise predictions	<p>In email correspondence, Highways England indicate that they estimate current traffic noise levels at 'Longhazel Caravan Park' to be 59.3 dB LA10 (18hr). They predict an increase of 2.2 dB in the short-term and 3.3dB in the long-term. This assessment is based on distances to AddressBase data points and not to property/land boundaries. So some lodges on the site might suffer greater exposure.</p> <p>Therefore, it would appear that by "Design Year", noise levels would have increased to around 62.6 dB LA10 (18hr).</p>	<p>The predictions are based on a CadnaA noise model that implements details of the topography, vertical and horizontal alignment, flows, road surfaces and many other factors and not just distances. The reported level was for the OS database receptor within the caravan park which is the home of Mr and Mrs Walton. It is correct that some lodges on the site are exposed to higher noise levels than Mr and Mrs Walton's home but none are exposed above the SOAEL in either the DM or DS cases in either the opening year or the design year (2038). The level of 62.6dB is the level at 4m (corresponding to first floor window) and for which a façade value correction of +2.5dB has been applied to account for sound reflection</p>	NOT AGREED

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status
		from the building. The level at the ground floor and without the façade correction would be lower.	
Noise predictions	<p>“The road alignment will be slightly changed near the site, and traffic volumes will increase substantially.</p> <p>Some mitigation against traffic noise is already provided by a 2.4m boundary fence on the north, west and east site boundaries. Mature planting in the A303 cutting further reduces some higher-pitched road noise and provides a useful visual barrier.”</p>	<p>The A303 alignment immediately adjacent to Long Hazel Park will have no substantial change.</p> <p>The 2.4m fence that is currently in place is offering little to no noise mitigation. It is in a poor state of repair, with holes in the fence and the A303 traffic visible. The fence is not an acoustic fence, so would have limited attenuation properties, even if in a good state of repair.</p>	NOT AGREED
Noise predictions	Long Hazel Park has contacted the applicant to inform them that the 2.4m fence has now been repaired.	Noted.	UNDER DISCUSSION
Noise predictions	<p>British Standard (BS) 8233: 2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings provides advice on acceptable external noise levels for residential property.</p> <p>With respect to noise affecting external areas such as amenity areas, BS 8233 states that “it is desirable that the steady noise level does not exceed 50 LAeq,T dB</p>	The quotation from the BS 8233 is incomplete because the paragraph continues “However, it is also recognized that these guideline values are not achievable in all circumstances where development might be desirable. In higher noise areas, such as city centres or urban areas adjoining the strategic transport network, a compromise between elevated noise levels and other factors, such as the convenience of living in these locations or making efficient use	NOT AGREED

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status
	<p>and 55 LAeq,T dB should be regarded as the upper limit".</p> <p>The units of noise (L10 (18-hour) dBA) commonly used to describe traffic noise can be translated into units used in this British Standard (Leq (0600 - 2400), dBA) using the Traffic Research Laboratory formula;</p> $y = 0.9887x - 1.7748$ <p>Where:</p> <p>y = Measured LAeq,18h dB, and</p> <p>x = Predicted LA10,18h dB</p> <p>Thus traffic noise of 62.6 dB LA10 (18hr) is equivalent to 60.1 LAeq (18hr) dB, and is somewhat in excess of the British Standard for amenity areas.</p> <p>In order to meet the lesser standard, this traffic noise at the amenity area for Lodge 2 needs to be brought down to below 55 dBA Leq,16h. The configuration of the lodge, perpendicular to the road with its amenity space between it and the next lodge, makes this difficult without addressing the noise at source, or improving the barrier..</p>	<p>of land resources to ensure development needs can be met, might be warranted. In such a situation, development should be designed to achieve the lowest practicable levels in these external amenity spaces, but should not be prohibited."</p> <p>The conversion is not challenged although this is not the standard conversion formula set out in the TRL report.</p> <p>The comparison between a façade value at 4m with a free-field value at ground level is not valid.</p>	
	<p>In relation to the comments regarding the fullness of the quotation made by Tegwyn Jones in his report about urbanisation and those who develop close to</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>NOT AGREED</p>

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status
	<p>highways would expect higher noise levels, we reiterate that we are in open countryside in a rural location. Our caravan park and business was first established in 1945. The old A303 came through the High Street with speed restrictions as a single carriageway. The dual carriageway which is now the A303 by-pass was formed after a section of the existing caravan park was acquired under a compulsory purchase order. Furthermore, since that time traffic volumes have increased enormously along with traffic noise. This noise is not our doing and we did not come to the noise the noise came to us. The measures put in place at the time by the Department of Transport were very frugal and this is why this time round the Secretary of State for Transport should and ought to address the issue because standards have changed.</p>		
Noise predictions	<p>A substantial increase in traffic flow is projected, and will be the cause of the noise increase. But a number of factors in the Highways England plan will provide noise mitigation for Long Hazel Park, such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •the carriageways adjacent to the site are in a deep cutting •mature planting within the cutting provides a visual, if not an acoustic, barrier •a noise-reducing thin surface course will be applied to the A303 and new slip roads within the scheme, and 	<p>An increase in traffic flow is expected and this has been included in the calculations of noise levels for future years.</p> <p>Additional mitigation beyond that proposed in the scheme is not justified as a consequence of the scheme: the site is currently affected by noise from the A303 and this will continue to be the case but the change in the long-term is minor and does not justify additional mitigation</p>	NOT AGREED

Topic	Mr and Mrs Walton's comment	Highways England response	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•a slight improvement in road gradient <p>Many years ago, the owners of Long Hazel park provided a 2.4m high fence along their northern boundary, and similar fencing to the west and east boundaries to reduce traffic noise. This fence is no longer in good repair.</p> <p>A significant improvement in noise levels on site could be achieved if Highways England were to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•replace the old 2.4m fence with a 3m fence., and•apply the noise-reducing thin surface course to the A303 beyond the eastern boundary of the scheme <p>This work would reduce noise at source, and protect dwellings on site from the worst effects of the increased traffic noise.</p>		

